

CORRES. CONTROL
OUTGOING LTR NO.

ORDER #10 CFR 830.120

99 RF00979



March 18, 1999

99-RF-00979

| DIST. | LTR | ENC |
|------------------|-----|-----|
| BENSUSSEN, S.J. | X | X |
| BORMOLINI, A.M. | X | X |
| BRAILSFORD, M.D. | X | X |
| BRYNER, C.J. | | |
| BURDGE, L. | X | X |
| CARD, R.G. | X | X |
| COSGROVE, M.M. | X | X |
| COX, C.M. | X | X |
| CRAWFORD, A.C. | X | X |
| DEJONG, V.J. | X | X |
| FERRERA, D.W. | | |
| FULTON, J.C. | X | X |
| HARDING, W.A. | X | X |
| MARTINEZ, L.A. | X | X |
| PARKER, A. | X | X |
| POLSTON, S. | X | X |
| SHELTON, D.C. | X | X |
| TUOR, N.R. | | |

Jessie M. Roberson
Manager
DOE, RFFO

REVISION 8 OF THE KAISER-HILL TEAM QUALITY ASSURANCE PROGRAM (QAP) -
RGC-024-99

Ref: Jessie M. Roberson ltr, 02771, to Robert G. Card, Review of the Kaiser-Hill Revision 7 of Both the Quality Assurance Program and Quality Assurance 10 CFR 830.120 Implementation Plan, November 16, 1998

Enclosed you will find Revision 8 of the Kaiser-Hill Team QAP. Revision 8 of the QAP addresses the Department of Energy's previous comments on Revision 7 including modifications to reflect the organization changes that have taken place since publication of Revision 7 on August 6, 1998. Specifically, the company changeover from DynCorp of Colorado, Inc., to Rocky Flats Closure Site Services and the reassignment of work between Rocky Mountain Remediation Services and Safe Sites of Colorado. In addition, the QAP has been revised to strengthen the tie between the Kaiser-Hill Team Quality Program and the TRU and Low-Level Waste Programs.

Enclosure 2 to this document is a summary of the non-editorial changes made to the QAP. None of the changes impact compliance with either 10 CRF 8320.120 or DOE Order 5700.6C. Non-editorial changes have been marked with a change bar.

If you have any questions on either of these documents, please contact Dr. Linda Smith on extension 5792.

| | | |
|--------------|---|---|
| COR. CONTROL | X | X |
| ADMN. RECORD | | |
| TRAFFIC | | |
| PATS/T130G | X | X |

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| CLASSIFICATION: | |
| UCNI | |
| UNCLASSIFIED | X |
| CONFIDENTIAL | X |
| SECRET | |

AUTHORIZED CLASSIFIER
SIGNATURE

Robert G. Card
President and CEO

Date 3/12/99

LCS:rb

IN REPLY TO RFP CC
NO:

Enclosures:
As Stated

ACTION ITEM STATUS

Orig. and 1 cc - Jessie M. Roberson

☐ PARTIAL/OPEN

cc:

☒ CLOSED

James Jeffries - DOE, RFFO

LTR APPROVALS:

ORIG. & TYPIST INITIALS

Kaiser-Hill Company, L.L.C.

Address: Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site, State Hwy. 93 and Cactus, Rocky Flats, Colorado 80402-0464
Mailing Address: P.O. Box 464, Golden, Colorado 80402-0464


Best Available Copy
ADMIN RECCRD
SW-SW-A-003123

Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site

Revision 8

KAISER-HILL TEAM QUALITY ASSURANCE PROGRAM

APPROVED BY:


President, Kaiser-Hill Company, L.L.C.

/ R. G. Card

3/19/99
Date

Responsible Organization: Quality Program

Effective Date: 3/19/99

ORC review not required
Periodic review frequency: 1 year from the effective date

Reviewed for
Classification/UCN

By



Date

3/12/99 U/N/A

The signatures on this page document that, for those areas under the representative's cognizance, the representative of each organization concurs that this write-up is accurate, factual, and reflects the organization's position.

CONCURRENCE—Kaiser-Hill Company, L.L.C.

/s/ S. Polston 3/16/99
S. Polston, Executive Vice President and
Chief Operating Officer

/s/ S. J. Bensussen 3/4/99
S. J. Bensussen, Vice President and
General Counsel

/s/ A. M. Bormolini 3/4/99
A. M. Bormolini, Vice President
Human Resources and Communications

/s/ M. D. Brailsford 3/8/99
M. D. Brailsford, Vice President
Safeguards, Security, Site Operations and
Integration

/s/ L. F. Burdge 3/4/99
L. F. Burdge, Vice President
Planning and Integration

/s/ W. A. Harding 3/15/99
W. A. Harding, Vice President
Safety Systems and Engineering

/s/ D. C. Shelton 3/1/99
D. C. Shelton, Vice President
Environmental Systems and Stewardship

/s/ L. A. Martinez 3/1/99
L. A. Martinez, Vice President and CFO
Finance and Administration

/s/ A. M. Parker 3/8/99
A. M. Parker, Vice President
Closure Projects Integration

/s/ J. C. Fulton 3/8/99
J. C. Fulton, Vice President
Nuclear Operations

3/19/99

CONCURRENCE — Principal Subcontractors

/s/ C. Cox 3/1/99
C. Cox, President
Safe Sites of Colorado

/s/ M. M. Cosgrove 2/26/99
M. M. Cosgrove, General Manager
Wackenhut Services, L. L. C.

/s/ A. c. Crawford 3/2/99
A. C. Crawford, President and General
Manager
Rocky Mountain Remediation Services,
L.L.C.

/s/ V. DeJong 3/1/99
V. DeJong, President and General Manager
Rocky Flats Closure Site Services

CONCURRENCE — Architect Engineering and Construction and Construction
Management Subcontractors

/s/ Paul M. Bell for 3/3/99
P. R. Bengel
President and General Manager
Denver West Remediation and
Construction

/s/ S. Scucci for 3/10/99
J. Novak
President
Rocky Flats Engineers and Constructors

/s/ C. Carruth for 3/8/99
J. Snelgrove
AE/CCM Program Manager
Foster Wheeler Environmental Corporation

/s/ J. Green 3/10/99
J. Green
Program Manager
OHM

LIST OF EFFECTIVE PAGES

| <u>Pages</u> | <u>Effective Date</u> | <u>Change Number</u> |
|--------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| 1 - 39 | 8/1/97 | Rev. 4 |
| 1 - 64 | 12/17/97 | Rev. 5 |
| 1 - 60 | 4/1/98 | Rev. 6 |
| 1 - 55 | 8/6/98 | Rev. 7 |
| 1 - 57 | 3/19/99 | Rev. 8 |

TOTAL NUMBER OF PAGES: 57

3/19/99

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| <u>Section</u> | <u>Page</u> |
|---|-------------|
| TITLE PAGE..... | 1 |
| CONCURRENCE PAGE..... | 2 |
| LIST OF EFFECTIVE PAGES | 4 |
| TABLE OF CONTENTS..... | 5 |
| 1.0 PURPOSE..... | 6 |
| 2.0 SCOPE | 6 |
| 3.0 DEFINITIONS AND ACRONYMS..... | 7 |
| 4.0 STANDARDS AND REQUIREMENTS..... | 9 |
| 5.0 GENERAL INFORMATION..... | 12 |
| 5.1 PROGRAM OVERVIEW | 12 |
| 5.2 ACCOUNTABILITY | 15 |
| 5.3 DOCUMENT HIERARCHY | 15 |
| 5.4 APPLICABILITY OF QUALITY ASSURANCE REQUIREMENTS TO SITE NUCLEAR FACILITIES | 18 |
| 5.5 GRADED APPROACH | 19 |
| 6.0 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES | 22 |
| 6.1 Organization | 22 |
| 6.2 Roles | 23 |
| 6.3 Responsibilities..... | 25 |
| 6.3.1 Kaiser-Hill President | 25 |
| 6.3.2 Kaiser-Hill Vice Presidents..... | 25 |
| 6.3.3 Kaiser-Hill Vice President, Safety Systems and Engineering..... | 26 |
| 6.3.4 Kaiser-Hill Quality Program Manager..... | 26 |
| 6.3.5 Site Quality Council | 27 |
| 6.3.6 Kaiser-Hill Principal Subcontractors and AE/CCM Subcontractors..... | 27 |
| 6.3.7 Individual Managers..... | 28 |
| 6.3.8 Site TRU Waste Project Quality Officer..... | 28 |
| 6.3.9 Site Low-Level Waste Quality Assurance Officer | 28 |
| 7.0 SITE QUALITY ASSURANCE PROGRAM | 29 |
| 7.1 Management | 29 |
| 7.1.1 Criterion 1, Program..... | 29 |
| 7.1.2 Criterion 2, Personnel Training and Qualification..... | 33 |
| 7.1.3 Criterion 3, Quality Improvement..... | 38 |
| 7.1.4 Criterion 4, Documents and Records | 47 |
| 7.2 Performance | 57 |
| 7.2.1 Criterion 5, Work Processes..... | 57 |
| 7.2.2 Criterion 6, Design..... | 67 |
| 7.2.3 Criterion 7, Procurement..... | 74 |
| 7.2.4 Criterion 8, Inspection and Acceptance Testing..... | 87 |
| 7.3 Assessments..... | 97 |
| 7.3.1 Criterion 9, Management Assessment..... | 97 |
| 7.3.2 Criterion 10, Independent Assessment..... | 98 |
| 8.0 IMPLEMENTATION PLAN | 99 |

FIGURE 1 - SITE QUALITY DOCUMENT HIERARCHY.....

APPENDIX 1 - GRADED APPROACH TO THE REQUIREMENTS OF 10 CFR 830.120....

Best Available Copy

1.0 PURPOSE

This document is the Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site (Site) Kaiser-Hill Team Quality Assurance Program (QAP). This QAP has been developed as required by 10 CFR 830.120, *Quality Assurance Requirements*, and Department of Energy (DOE) Order 5700.6C, *Quality Assurance*. This QAP discusses how the quality assurance (QA) criteria of 10 CFR 830.120 and DOE Order 5700.6C are being met and the roles and responsibilities of the Kaiser-Hill Company, L.L.C. (Kaiser-Hill), the Integrating Management Contractor (IMC); the four Principal Subcontractors: Rocky Flats Closure Site Services (CSS), Rocky Mountain Remediation Services, L.L.C. (RMRS), Safe Sites of Colorado (SSOC), and Wackenhut Services, L.L.C. (WSLLC); and the four Architect Engineering/Construction and Construction Management (AE/CCM) subcontractors: Denver West Remediation and Construction, L.L.C. (DWRC), Rocky Flats Engineers and Constructors (RFEC), Foster Wheeler Environmental Corporation (FWENC), and OHM. Kaiser-Hill and the four Principal Subcontractors comprise the Kaiser-Hill Team.

Each of the individual Principal and AE/CCM Subcontractors shall develop company specific quality program description documents (commonly called Quality Assurance Program Plans or QAPPs) to describe how their company will comply with the Kaiser-Hill Team QAP or use the Kaiser-Hill Team QAP as their program. Kaiser-Hill works to the Kaiser-Hill Team QAP.

2.0 SCOPE

This *Kaiser-Hill Team QAP* provides a road map for organizations, management, and stakeholders to help them understand how the requirements are implemented. It is applicable to the IMC, Principal Subcontractors, AE/CCM subcontractors and organizations working under the direction of the IMC, the Principal or the AE/CCM subcontractors.

The QAP describes roles and responsibilities, for implementing the requirements of 10 CFR 830.120 for nuclear facilities and activities, and DOE Order 5700.6C for non-nuclear facilities, activities, and services. This is a revision to and supersedes the Kaiser-Hill Team QAP Revision 7 dated August 6, 1998.

3/19/99

3.0 DEFINITIONS AND ACRONYMS

Nonreactor Nuclear Facility - Activities or operations that involve radioactive and/or fissionable materials in such form and quantity that a nuclear hazard potentially exists to the employees or the general public. Incidental use and generating of radioactive materials in a facility operation (e.g., check and calibration sources, use of radioactive sources in research and experimental and analytical laboratory activities, electron microscopes, and X-ray machines) would not ordinarily require the facility to be included in this definition. Transportation of radioactive materials, accelerators and reactors, and their operations are not included. The application of any rule to a nonreactor nuclear facility shall be applied using a graded approach. Included are activities or operations that:

- (1) Produce, process, or store radioactive liquid or solid waste, fissionable materials, or tritium;
- (2) Conduct separations operations;
- (3) Conduct irradiated materials inspection, fuel fabrication, decontamination, or recovery operations;
- (4) Conduct fuel enrichment operations;
- (5) Perform environmental remediation or waste management activities involving radioactive materials; or
- (6) Design, manufacture, or assemble items for use with radioactive materials and/or fissionable materials in such form or quantity that a nuclear hazard potentially exists. (10 CFR 830.3, Definitions)

Nuclear Facility - Reactor and nonreactor nuclear facilities. (10 CFR 830.3, Definitions) Note: The requirements of 10 CFR 830.120 also apply to a nuclear facility under construction.

Quality - The condition achieved when an item, service, or process meets or exceeds the user's requirements and expectations. (10 CFR 830.3, Definitions)

Quality Assurance - All those actions that provide confidence that quality is achieved. (10 CFR 830.3, Definitions)

Quality Assurance Program (QAP) - The overall program established to assign responsibilities and authorities, define policies and requirements, and

3/19/99

provide for the performance and assessment of work. (10 CFR 830.3, *Definitions*)

Quality Assurance Program Plan (QAPP) - The document of a Principal or AE/CCM Subcontractor expressing how the Subcontractor will comply with the applicable requirements of the Kaiser-Hill Team QAP. A Subcontractor QAPP may be satisfied by documented endorsement of the Kaiser-Hill Team QAP.

Other quality related definitions can be found in the *Glossary of Terms* in the *Quality Assurance Manual*.

The following acronyms are used in this document:

| | |
|------------------|--|
| AB | Authorization Basis |
| AE/CCM | Architect and Engineering/Construction and Construction Management |
| ALARA | As-Low-As Reasonably Achievable |
| ASAP | Accelerated Site Action Project |
| BFO | Basis for Operation |
| BIO | Basis for Interim Operation |
| CAO | U. S. Department of Energy, Carlsbad Area Office |
| COEM | <i>Conduct of Engineering Manual</i> |
| COOP | <i>Conduct of Operations Manual (I-MAN-COOP)</i> |
| CSS | Rocky Flats Closure Site Services |
| D&D | Decontaminate and Decommission |
| DCI IT | Dyncorp of Colorado, Information Technology |
| DOE | DOE Department of Energy |
| DWRC | Denver West Remediation and Construction |
| EM | Environmental Management |
| EPA | Environmental Protection Agency |
| FWENC | Foster Wheeler Environmental Corporation |
| HASP | Health and Safety Plan |
| HQ | DOE Headquarters |
| IMC | Integrating Management Contractor |
| ISMS | Integrated Safety Management System |
| IWCP | Integrated Work Control Program |
| JHA | Job Hazards Analysis |
| Kaiser-Hill Team | Kaiser-Hill and the Principal Subcontractors |
| Kaiser-Hill | Kaiser-Hill Company, L. L. C. |
| LLW | Low Level Waste |
| M&TE | Measuring and Test Equipment |
| MAL | Master Activity List |

3/19/99

| | |
|-------|---|
| OHM | OHM |
| PATS | Plant Action Tracking System |
| QA | Quality Assurance |
| QAP | Quality Assurance Program |
| QAPP | Quality Assurance Program Plan |
| RFEC | Rocky Flats Engineers and Constructors |
| RFFO | Rocky Flats Field Office |
| RMRS | Rocky Mountain Remediation Services, L.L.C. |
| RWP | Radiological Work Permit |
| SAR | Safety Analysis Report |
| SCARM | <i>Site Corrective Action Requirements Manual (1-MAN-012-SCARM)</i> |
| SDRM | <i>Site Documents Requirements Manual (1-MAN-001-SDRM)</i> |
| SERM | <i>Site Engineering Requirements Manual (1-MAN-027-SERM)</i> |
| SIOM | <i>Site Integrated Oversight Manual (1-MAN-013-SIOM)</i> |
| Site | Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site |
| SSOC | Safe Sites of Colorado |
| TRU | Transuranic |
| TUM | <i>Training User's Manual</i> |
| TYP | <i>Ten Year Plan</i> |
| WAD | Work Authorization Document |
| WBS | Work Breakdown Structure |
| WSLLC | Wackenhut Services, L.L.C. |

4.0 STANDARDS AND REQUIREMENTS

The Kaiser-Hill contract with DOE contains the list of DOE Directives imposed on the Kaiser-Hill Team by DOE. The Kaiser-Hill Team QA requirements are identified in the *Quality Assurance Program Criteria* document (Section 7 of the *Site QA Manual*). The foundation upon which the *Quality Assurance Program Criteria* document was developed was the *DOE Environment, Safety, and Health Configuration Guide*. The *Quality Assurance Program Criteria* document development began with a search for QA regulations, orders, and consensus standards, without regard to applicability. In all, 28 QA documents were identified and obtained. The QA documents were reviewed for possible applicability to Site activities. Several documents were set aside as not applicable.

A hierarchy of the documents was selected to place a relative level of importance on the documents in case of conflict between documents. The QA

3/19/99

criteria of 10 CFR 830.120 and DOE Order 5700.6C were incorporated. The remaining applicable documents were reviewed and appropriate sections selected that, in the opinion of the writers, best described specific features that the criteria of 10 CFR 830.120 and DOE Order 5700.6C required. In the end, several documents remained that were applicable but not used. These documents contained information that was redundant to, or not as clear as, that selected from other sources. The selected documents/sections are listed in the *Quality Assurance Program Criteria* document.

The development of the *Quality Assurance Program Criteria* document involved the Rocky Flats Field Office (RFFO), and Site subject matter experts having QA experience in the DOE complex or the nuclear industry. Based on their comments and using an iterative process, the *Quality Assurance Program Criteria* document, as well as this QAP, were further refined. The *Quality Assurance Program Criteria* document and this QAP are issued as sections in the *Site QA Manual*.

The requirements for the *Quality Assurance Program Criteria* document were selected from the following thirteen technical standards which remained after evaluation and selection of the appropriate QA documents:

- 10 CFR 820, *Procedural Rules for Nuclear Activities*
- 10 CFR 830.120, *Quality Assurance Requirements*
- DOE Order 5700.6C, *Quality Assurance*
- ASME-NQA-1-1989, *Quality Assurance Requirements for Nuclear Facility Applications*, 1989
- ASME-NQA-1-1994, *Quality Assurance Requirements for Nuclear Facility Applications*, 1994
- ASME-NQA-1-1994, Subpart 2.7, *Quality Assurance Requirements of Computer Software for Nuclear Facility Operations*
- ASME-NQA-3-1989, *Quality Assurance Requirements for the Collection of Scientific and Technical Information for Site Characterization of High-Level Nuclear Waste Repositories*
- ANSI/ASQC-E4-1994, *Specifications and Guidelines for Quality Systems for Environmental Data Collection and Environmental Technology Programs*
- 40 CFR 194, *Criteria for the Certification and Re-Certification of the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant's Compliance with the 40 CFR Part 191 Disposal Regulations*, April 9, 1996
- ASTM -C-1009-89, *Standard Guide for Establishing a Quality Assurance Program for Analytical Chemistry Laboratories Within the Nuclear Industry*
- DOE /AL-QC-1, 1995, *Quality Criteria*

3/19/99

- ANSI/NCSL Z540-1-1994, *Calibration Laboratories and Measuring and Test Equipment - General Requirements*
- 10 CFR 71, *Packaging and Transportation of Radioactive Material*, Subpart H *Quality Assurance*

In addition, DOE Carlsbad Area Office (CAO) quality program requirements that apply to Site activities where Transuranic (TRU) waste will be characterized, packaged or shipped are specified in *USDOE Carlsbad Area Office Quality Assurance Program Document*, CAO-94-1012 and *USDOE Carlsbad Area Office Quality Assurance Program Plan* CAO-94-1010. Site implementation of these requirements is specified in the *TRU Waste Management Manual*, 1-MAN-008-WM-001, and the *WIPP Isolation Pilot Project Transuranic Waste Characterization Program Quality Assurance Project Program Plan*, 95-QAPjP-0050. Appropriate requirements from these documents have been incorporated into Principal Subcontractor QAPPs and are being incorporated into AE/CCM subcontractor QAPPs. Additionally these requirements are included in the *Kaiser-Hill Team Quality Manual* Section 7, *Quality Assurance Criteria Document*.

The IMC, the Principal Subcontractors and the AE/CCMs are responsible for communicating to their subcontractors that directly affect the waste characterization data the performance requirements of and the need to comply with CAO-94-1010 and CAO-94-1012. In addition the IMC, the Principal Subcontractors and the AE/CCMs are responsible for the verification of such subcontractors compliance with these requirements.

Nevada Test Site (NTS) quality program requirements which apply to Site activities where Low Level Waste (LLW) is characterized, certified and packaged or shipped are specified in the *Nevada Test Site Waste Acceptance Criteria* (NTS-WAC). The Site implements the NTS-WAC, including NTS QA requirements, in the *Low Level Waste Management Plan* (LLWMP), 94-RWP/EWQA-0014. Operations that process LLW must comply with the requirements and procedures identified in this QAP and the LLWMP. Appropriate requirements from these documents are being incorporated into Principal Subcontractor and AE/CCM subcontractor QAPPs.

Future changes to Site standards will be conducted through the established Order Compliance process for insertion into the Kaiser-Hill contract. Standards that are required by law or contract are mandatory unless an agency having proper regulatory authority has granted a temporary or permanent exemption from that requirement. The criteria for granting an exemption to a DOE nuclear safety requirement are specified in 10 CFR 820.62, *Criteria*.

5.0 GENERAL INFORMATION

5.1 Program Overview

This Kaiser-Hill Team QAP describes the roles, responsibilities and activities for implementing the requirements of 10 CFR 830.120 for nuclear facilities and activities with the potential to cause radiological harm and DOE Order 5700.6C for non-nuclear facilities and activities.

Since 10 CFR 830.120 and DOE Order 5700.6C include identical criteria, the IMC has incorporated the requirements into a single program document. The primary distinction between the two requirements is enforceability and applicability. From the perspective of applicability and enforceability, 10 CFR 830.120 applies to nuclear facilities and nuclear activities, and DOE Order 5700.6C applies to non-nuclear facilities, activities, and services.

On July 1, 1995, Kaiser-Hill became the IMC for the Site under a performance-based contract. As the IMC, Kaiser-Hill has overall responsibility for the Site and implements the Site mission through four Principal Subcontractors and four AE/CCM Subcontractors. Each of the Principal Subcontractors has specific areas of responsibility. CSS provides Site services in support of nuclear facilities such as metrology, commodity procurement, transportation, limited maintenance, and receipt inspection. RMRS performs Site environmental remediation, waste management, decontamination and decommissioning of facilities and is responsible for several specific nuclear facilities. SSOC and RMRS perform operations and maintenance for the majority of the Site's nuclear facilities. SSOC performs residue processing and special nuclear materials management for the Site. WSLLC provides security services for the Site. Kaiser-Hill and the Principal Subcontractors form the Kaiser-Hill Team. The four AE/CCM subcontractors, DWRC, RFEC, FWENC, and OHM provide a broad range of AE/CCM services as specifically described and authorized by task orders under contract to Kaiser-Hill.

3/19/99

Due to the varied nature of the activities and responsibilities being performed, individual Principal and AE/CCM Subcontractors are responsible for specific programs and activities that are unique to their area of expertise. As such, each has developed company-specific QAPPs to describe how their company complies with the Kaiser-Hill Team QAP to accomplish their specific mission. Principal Subcontractor QAPPs addresses all 10 CFR 830.120 and DOE 5700.6C criterion and requirements as applicable to their scope. AE/CCM Subcontractor QAPPs address the quality program requirements as specified in their contract. In addition, since AE/CCM Subcontractors perform work to individual task orders, their QAPPs specify how specific task order QA Program requirements are addressed to assure compliance with all applicable requirements.

[Note: At the discretion of Kaiser-Hill, specific workscope may be reassigned among existing Principal and AE/CCM subcontractors. If necessary to cover the new work, the subcontractor QAPP will be modified in a reasonable period of time. Until the formal modification of the QAPP, the subcontractor shall ensure that new work scope is accomplished in accordance with the Site QAP. New Principal and AE/CCM subcontractors may be obtained by the IMC, and/or existing Principal and AE/CCM subcontractors may be phased out. New Principal and AE/CCM subcontractors are required to develop Site specific QAPPs, perform baseline assessments against 10 CFR 830.120 and develop Quality Assurance Implementation Plans for 10 CFR 830.120 prior to the start of work on the Site with the potential to cause radiological harm.]

The Site is in the post-production, cleanup, and closure phase of its life cycle. Major planning activities are currently underway to support accelerated closure over the next decade. Included in this planning are the identification and prioritization of facilities for decontamination, deactivation, decommissioning, dismantling, and/or future use. One of the primary focuses of the Site is the performance of risk reduction activities including the preparation of nuclear materials for interim storage, liquid residue stabilization, and the elimination and mitigation of Site hazards. Also among the Site's planning activities are the identification and establishment of interim storage facilities.

The Site has instituted an Integrated Safety Management System (ISMS) through which ongoing and future activities that have the potential to cause harm to the workers, public and environment are identified and evaluated. Implementation of the *ISMS Manual, (1-MAN-016-ISM)* was reported complete September 30, 1998. Assessments to verify implementation have been conducted. The ISMS integrates safety standards/requirements into the work planning and execution processes and when implemented effectively

3/19/99

protects the workers, the public and the environment. The ISMS combines a diverse group of people and risk-graded infrastructure programs to satisfy the multiple safety environmental, and health needs uniformly. The ISMS identifies the mechanisms for increasing worker involvement in work planning, including hazard and environmental impact identification, analysis, and control; work execution; and feedback/improvement processes. The ISMS is primarily based on the philosophies, principles, and requirements of the *Department of Energy (DOE) Safety Management System Policy (DOE P 450.4)*, *Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB) Recommendation 95-2*, *Department of Energy Acquisition Regulation (DEAR) clause 970.5204-2*, and current infrastructure programs in use at the Site. The development of safety management programs using these standards and applying the graded approach to standards implementation is intended to provide an appropriate level of protection and control for the conduct of work.

The hazards that are credible and have consequences that could cause harm to the worker, the public or the environment are identified, analyzed and categorized. Controls for these hazards and their consequences are then developed. Site documents used to adequately define the controls include: the *Nuclear Safety Manual, 1-MAN-018-NSM* and the *Nuclear Criticality Safety Manual* which establish a formal set of controls and requirements for a range of activities, usually a facility; the *Integrated Work Control Program (IWCP) Manual, 1-MAN-071-IWCP*, which describes how work is planned, hazards identified, and work controlled; the *Integrated Safety Management System Manual, 1-MAN-016-ISM*, which describes how activities with the potential to cause harm are identified and controlled; and the *Site Engineering Requirements Manual, MAN-027-SERM (SERM)*, which provides Site Engineering Requirements.

The ISMS relationship to the application of quality assurance for nuclear facilities and other activities at the Site is embodied in five basic functions: 1) Define the scope of work; 2) Identify and analyze the hazards; 3) Identify and implement controls; 4) Perform the work; and 5) Provide feedback. The incorporation of quality assurance requirements into these functions is enhanced from previous application due to the ISMS by integration of the existing Site infrastructure established to implement the 10 QA Program criteria. The Site infrastructure includes the documents identified in the preceding paragraph as well as others, such as the *Conduct of Engineering Manual (COEM)*; *Conduct of Operations Manual 1-MAN-066-COOP (COOP)*; and the *TRU Waste Management Manual, 1-MAN-008-WM-001* and the *Low Level Waste Management Plan, 94-RWP/EWQA-0014* for radioactive waste.

3/19/99

5.2 Accountability

As the IMC, Kaiser-Hill has overall responsibility for the Site and for QA at the Site. Kaiser-Hill requires activities with the potential to cause radiological harm to be conducted in accordance with 10 CFR 830.120 and other activities to be conducted in accordance with DOE Order 5700.6C.

Quality Assurance is a shared interdisciplinary function. It involves management and individual contributors of all organizations responsible for producing items, performing activities and services, and independently verifying that items, activities, and services comply with specified standards and requirements.

Each individual is responsible for the quality of their work, for reducing costs, for identifying nonconforming items, and for complying with requirements and procedures. Individuals who are responsible for producing an item or performing an activity, and their immediate management, have direct and final responsibility for the quality of the item, activity, or service. They are responsible for reviewing item reliability, process implementation, and other quality-related information and analyzing data to identify items and processes needing improvement.

Individuals or organizations assigned responsibility for the quality function and for verifying that activities affecting quality have been correctly performed have sufficient authority, access to work areas, and organizational freedom to:

- identify quality problems and initiate, recommend, or provide solutions to resolve identified problems;
- verify implementation of solutions;
- verify that nonconforming conditions are dispositioned in accordance with approved procedures; and
- directly access levels of management required to resolve identified problems.

5.3 Document Hierarchy

Figure 1 provides an overview of the Site Quality Document Hierarchy. It applies to the Kaiser-Hill Team and lower-tier contractors.

The *Quality Assurance Program Criteria* document contains the current Kaiser-Hill Team QA requirements.

3/19/99


The quality management philosophy of the IMC is expressed in the *QA Policy*. The *QA Policy* establishes the IMC commitment to ensure that QA requirements are addressed and risks and environmental impacts are minimized, while safety, security, reliability, and performance are maximized.

The *Site Quality Assurance Manual* contains the following (See Figure 1):

- *Quality Assurance Program Mission and Vision.*
- *Kaiser-Hill Team Quality Assurance Program.*
- *Quality Assurance Program Glossary of Terms.* The Glossary applies to documents developed to standardize the *Kaiser-Hill Team QAP* and its implementation. In case of conflict between the definitions contained in the Glossary of Terms and those contained in other Site documents, the definitions in the Glossary of Terms take precedence where pertaining to quality and the *Kaiser-Hill Team QAP*.
- *Quality Assurance Program Infrastructure Document List.* A list of the Site level infrastructure documents that implement the QA requirements. [Note: The *Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site Transuranic Waste Characterization Program, Quality Assurance Program Description Matrix (INS-246)* is a separate document that provides a crosswalk of DOE CAO-94-1012 quality requirements to applicable Site documents. The *Low Level Waste Management Plan, Appendix 5, Implementation Matrix for Quality Assurance Requirements* provides a crosswalk of Nevada Test Site quality assurance requirements for waste acceptance with applicable Site documents.]
- *Site Quality Council Charter.* The Site Quality Council provides a mechanism for interaction between the IMC and the Principal Subcontractors on quality matters. The Site Quality Council provides guidance and direction for the development and implementation of the *Kaiser-Hill Team QAP*.
- *Quality Assurance Program Criteria* document.
This document established the Quality Assurance Program requirements for the Site. The program incorporates requirements for several sources, including 10 CFR 830.120. Both nuclear and non-nuclear activities fall under the umbrella of the Quality Assurance Program and therefore incorporate the provisions of 10 CFR 830.120 and DOE 5700.6C.

3/19/99

Figure 1
Site Quality
Document Hierarchy



5.3.1 The company-specific QAPPs describe how each company will comply with the *Kaiser-Hill Team QAP* to accomplish its own specific mission.

5.3.2 Based on company-specific input, the IMC developed the *Kaiser-Hill Team Quality Assurance 10 CFR 830.120 Implementation Plan*. All actions that were identified in the Implementation Plan have been reported complete. Noncompliances with 10 CFR 830.120 are reported in accordance with the Site Price-Anderson reporting process.

The IMC and Principal Subcontractors are responsible for adhering to the Site infrastructure programs and procedures and for the development and implementation of company-specific procedures as needed for accomplishment of individual company-specific activities. Company-specific work instructions necessary for the accomplishment of the individual missions of the IMC and Principal Subcontractors can be found in their company-specific procedures. AE/CCM Subcontractor QAPPs identify the Site infrastructure programs and procedures for which they are responsible, in addition to specific requirements identified in the individual task orders.

5.4 **Applicability of Quality Assurance Requirements to Site Nuclear Facilities**

10 CFR 830.120 applies to nuclear facilities and to activities with the potential to cause radiological harm; however, the applicability of 10 CFR 830.120 is not limited to hazard category 2 and 3 nuclear facilities. 10 CFR 830.120 is applicable to activities that have the potential for causing radiological harm regardless of where they occur. The specific facility Authorization Basis (AB) document identifies the category of the nuclear facility in accordance with DOE Order 5480.23 under the general supervision of Kaiser-Hill. Each Principal Subcontractor, as applicable, is responsible for the development and maintenance of the facility AB documents for Hazard Category 2 and 3 nuclear facilities. The *Site Safety Analysis Report* (SAR) contains a comprehensive listing of the category of each Site nuclear facility as identified in the AB documents. Kaiser-Hill Safety Systems and Engineering is responsible to maintain the Site SAR.

Quality assurance requirements for activities that have the potential to cause radiological harm are implemented as a part of the Site infrastructure. The Site safety management infrastructure is integrated through the ISMS processes which ensures that the scope of work is defined, hazards are identified and analyzed, controls are identified and implemented to prevent or mitigate the consequences of the hazards, work is performed and feedback of results of these processes are provided to management to ensure continuous improvement for safety. Site infrastructure documents include controls to address 10 CFR 830.120 requirements and include the *Nuclear Safety Manual, 1-MAN-018-NSM*, and the *Nuclear Criticality Safety Manual* in addition to the QAP, *Site Documents Requirements Manual, 1-MAN-001-SDRM*, (SDRM), COOP, COEM, IWCP and the SERM.

Hazards are identified, analyzed, and categorized and controls for these hazards and their consequences are developed based on the hazards. This is accomplished through the ISMS process. This can include the process of developing a SAR, Basis for Interim Operations (BIO) or Basis for Operation (BFO) for nuclear activities, or Health and Safety Plans (HASPs), Job Hazards Analyses (JHA), As-Low-As Reasonably-Achievable (ALARA) reviews, Radiological Work Permits (RWPs), Remedial Investigations/Design Plans, Feasibility Studies, or Proposed Action Memoranda (PAM) for non-nuclear/radiological and industrial hazardous activities. Whether or not a SAR, BIO, or BFO must be developed for a given activity, set of activities, or facility can be determined by performing a hazards analysis per DOE standards *DOE-EM-STD-5502-94, Hazard Baseline Documentation*, *DOE-STD-1027-92, Guidance on Preliminary Hazardous Classification and*

3/19/99

Accident Analysis Technique for Compliance with DOE Order 5480.23, Safety Analysis Reports, and DOE-STD-3009-94, Preparation Guide for USDOE Non-Reactor Nuclear Facility Safety Analysis Reports, and DOE memorandum from Richard L. Black, dated June 6, 1997, addressing hazard categorization.

Hazards analysis identifies the potential severity of consequences of the hazards. The ISMS process will include Quality Assurance requirements review during development of the activity definition and independent Cross Table Review process, as applicable. This will ensure the application of the proper procedures based on 10 CFR 830.120 or DOE 5700.6C to adequately control the work commensurate with the hazards and consequences of the activities.

Work planning applies the necessary controls to mitigate or prevent the consequences of the hazards. Pre-evolution briefings are conducted with workers to review the work planning, applicable procedures, safety analyses and other pertinent safety precautions. Pre-evolution briefings are required for tasks in nuclear facilities and complex or uncertain tasks outside nuclear facilities.

5.5 Graded Approach

Graded approach is the process by which the levels of analysis, documentation, and other actions necessary to implement the QA requirements are based on facility/activity specific factors.

10 CFR 830.120 and DOE Order 5700.6C are applied to the Site through the use of graded approach. In order to ensure the most efficient use of resources, graded approach is used to determine the rigor with which the QA requirements are applied to a specific facility or activity. This approach provides the flexibility to implement the programs in a way that best suits the facility or activity while maintaining full compliance with the 10 CFR 830.120 and DOE Order 5700.6C. The facilities at Rocky Flats are identified as hazard category 2 or 3 nuclear facilities, radiological facilities, or other facilities. There are no hazard category 1 nuclear facilities at the Site. Because the SARs were written when the facilities were operational, they may reflect the need for more stringent safety requirements and operational needs. They may represent an over commitment for what is needed for an end-of-life facility that will be decontaminated and decommissioned. As new AB documents are prepared, they will adequately reflect the requirements appropriate for the current Site mission.

3/19/99

Consistent with *DOE STD-1082-94, Preparation, Review, and Approval of Implementation Plans for Nuclear Safety Requirements*, the Kaiser-Hill Team organization responsible for a nuclear safety requirement has been empowered to use its best judgement in the determination of the appropriate graded approach to be used to achieve full implementation of the requirement. This judgment is based on detailed knowledge of the specific requirements, features, resources, needs, goals, and interface with other organizations and facilities. The graded approach utilized to comply with a QA requirement was developed by application of the best judgements of a group of experts who have collectively broad knowledge of the applicable facilities and activities, of the safety management program for applicable facilities and activities, and of the collective wisdom behind the established regulatory requirements as defined in regulations and amplified by related technical standards and guides.

Each Site-applicable procedure implementing a Site infrastructure program (QA requirements) has provided in the instructions section, as appropriate, the level of analysis, documentation, and actions necessary to comply with the QA requirements based on a graded approach.

Additionally, procedures and other documents that implement Site infrastructure programs with direct impact on work and work processes receive independent review under the existing Site infrastructure. This independent review utilizes an interdisciplinary technical evaluation process to evaluate safety issues and (implicitly) quality aspects. Further, work-level instructions, procedures, and other instruments of work control developed under the Site infrastructure programs receive independent review (through the parallel review process) as a verification of the implementation of safety and program (including quality) requirements, where the work to be performed meets threshold risk requirements. This process as a whole validates the grading and application of QA requirements.

The following general criteria are guiding principles in the application of graded approach by the Kaiser-Hill Team:

- Graded approach may not be used to avoid compliance with federal, state, and local regulations.
- The higher the risk, the more rigor is required to ensure that requirements are met.
- Site facilities and activities are graded as either nuclear or non-nuclear facilities or activities.
- The program owner organization, because it has detailed knowledge of processes, items, activities, and programs, uses best judgment in determining the rigor of requirement implementation, administrative

3/19/99

controls, and business practices to be applied to ensure requirements are met.

- Implementing procedures and work plans reflect the use of the graded approach by setting forth direction for the amount of analysis, documentation, and actions required to ensure requirements are met.

Graded approach is a dynamic and iterative process designed to meet the QA requirements considering and using individually, or in combination, the following criteria:

- The relative importance to safety, safeguards, and security - The relative importance of an activity or item to safety, security, safeguards, environment, or mission provides the basis for establishing the order of completion or the depth, rigor, and thoroughness in applying the requirement. (For example: the corrective action process provides for grading deficiencies and other action items by significance level. Corrective actions are scheduled and accomplished based, in part, on significance.)
- The magnitude of any hazard involved - Consideration of the risks and hazards of the facility allows the implementing organization to focus resources on the activities most likely to reduce the associated risks and hazards by tailoring the implementing actions to the specific risks and hazards at the individual facilities and activities. (For example: activities to stabilize plutonium were given high priority in the Site closure planning process in order to reduce the hazardous condition.)
- The life cycle stage of a facility - The consideration of the life cycle stage of a facility permits the implementing organization to assess the appropriate application for the current life cycle stage of the facility. (For example: a facility that has the source material removed, and that is scheduled for decontamination and decommissioning, should have fewer requirements than a plutonium storage facility.)
- The programmatic mission of a facility - The programmatic mission of a facility, including passive missions such as contamination confinement and material storage, may dictate the degree of gradation for the implementation of a requirement. (For example: an operating facility that processes plutonium should have more rigorous and a larger number of requirements than a material storage facility.)
- The particular characteristics of a facility - The particular characteristics of a facility influence how nuclear safety requirements are applied. (For example: a waste storage facility should have fewer requirements than a plutonium facility performing stabilization activities.)

3/19/99

- Any other relevant factor - One such factor might be phased implementation of a requirement (by time or by facility). Phased implementation minimizes the impact on resources and allows for a learning curve.

Graded approach has been utilized during the development of the Site infrastructure programs and implementing procedures. Graded approach is built into Site infrastructure programs and procedures including, but not limited to: Policies and Procedures, Operational Readiness Reviews, Configuration Management, Training and Qualification, Emergency Management, Security and Safeguards, Engineering, Maintenance, Conduct of Operations, Radiation Protection, Occurrence Reporting, Procurement, Waste Management, and Nuclear Safety. The Corrective Actions Process provides a mechanism for prioritizing and evaluating unclassified deficiencies, concerns, and improvements. It is the primary responsibility of the Line organizations to ensure that QA requirements are applied in a manner commensurate with the work being accomplished. Line organization is defined as those organizations responsible for the execution of programs and conduct of work. It is the responsibility of Kaiser-Hill to assure Line organization execute responsibilities in compliance with Quality Assurance requirements. The documents which govern the graded approach process are the QAP, the SDRM and the *ISMS Manual*. The QAP provides the graded approach criteria, while the SDRM describes the controls to assure the criteria are considered when developing implementing procedures. The *ISMS Manual* integrates these procedures to identify the controls to be applied when determining the prevention or mitigation of the consequences of hazards.

Appendix 1, *Graded Approach To The Requirements of 10 CFR 830.120*, describes how graded approach is applied to each of the ten criteria of 10 CFR 830.120.

For activities related to TRU Waste generation, packaging, certification and transportation, procedure 1-*PRO-077-WIPP-006, Quality Assurance Grading* is used.

6.0 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

6.1 Organization

The Kaiser-Hill Team organizational structure, functional responsibilities (including integration and implementation responsibilities), lines of authority, and interfaces are identified in the *Rocky Flats Closure Project Functions and*

3/19/99

Responsibilities Document. This manual provides clearly defined responsibilities for each Kaiser-Hill Team member at the Site and is designed so that each Team member:

- Understands the major Site functions.
- Understands the differences between Kaiser-Hill integration responsibilities and Principal Subcontractor work performance responsibilities.
- Recognizes the Kaiser-Hill organization with integration responsibilities and overall accountability for each function.
- Recognizes the Principal Subcontractor, or in some cases, the Kaiser-Hill organization, with implementation responsibilities for each function.
- Recognizes the organizational units with whom each Team member interfaces.
- Understands the responsibilities for facility maintenance and operations.
- Knows the Kaiser-Hill person to call to solve a problem associated with a particular function.

Kaiser-Hill carries out the functions, objectives, and goals of the IMC. Multiple contractors, consisting of four major direct subcontractors known as Principal Subcontractors and four AE/CCM Subcontractors, perform work. Work scope may shift between the Principal Subcontractors, new Principal Subcontractors may be added, or existing Principal Subcontractors phased out at the discretion of Kaiser-Hill. Additional AE/CCM contracts may be established by Kaiser-Hill in the future. The *Rocky Flats Closure Project Functions and Responsibilities Document* will be revised to reflect new organizational roles accordingly.

Each of the Principal and AE/CCM Subcontractors report to one of the IMC's organizational units. In addition, several lower-tier contractors provide support to the IMC, Principal and AE/CCM Subcontractors.

The interfaces and interactions between the IMC, Principal Subcontractors and AE/CCM Subcontractors are established in their respective subcontracts and task orders, and are identified in the *Rocky Flats Closure Project Functions and Responsibilities Document*.

6.2 Roles

The following is a brief discussion of the roles and responsibilities of the IMC, Principal and AE/CCM Subcontractors in accomplishing the mission of the Site.

3/19/99

Kaiser-Hill as the IMC has overall responsibility for Site activities and is accountable to the DOE for the safe performance of work. As the IMC Kaiser-Hill provides certain site-wide functions and services including: the Site Policies and Procedures, Document Control, Records Management Programs (except for management of WIPP related records which are maintained by RMRS), the Waste Certification Officials, maintenance of the Plant Action Tracking System (PATs), and the Site Emergency Preparedness Program. Kaiser-Hill also serves as the primary point of contact with DOE for Price-Anderson Amendments Act Reporting.

RMRS is responsible for the waste management, environmental protection, environmental restoration, related engineering and construction and decontamination and decommissioning activities at the Site. In addition, RMRS TRU Programs has been delegated the authority and the responsibility to administer and coordinate the TRU Waste Program for the Site. Responsibilities include management and control of records for the Site related to WIPP, NTS and other disposal sites; development, deployment and implementation of program controls; waste inspection; and interface with regulators and the DOE for the Site for TRU Waste. RMRS provides direction to the Site for the Radiological Protection Program. In its engineering role RMRS provides the Site with subject matter experts in the different engineering disciplines including the Welding Program, Fire Protection Program, and Facility Design. RMRS administers the Engineering Document Control Center. RMRS is accountable to Kaiser-Hill for the safe performance of work.

SSOC, as a Principal Subcontractor to Kaiser-Hill, is responsible for the reduction of plutonium and residue vulnerabilities, implementation of the Site Nuclear Safety, and Nuclear Criticality Programs, and deactivation of special nuclear materials facilities. SSOC is also the Site technical authority for Non Destructive Assay on Site and operates the Site Analytical Laboratories. SSOC is accountable to Kaiser-Hill for the safe performance of work.

CSS, as a Principal Subcontractor to Kaiser-Hill, provides Site support services including waste commodity procurement, transportation, receiving inspection, facility inspection and metrology. CSS is accountable to Kaiser-Hill for the safe performance of work.

WSLLC, as a Principal Subcontractor to Kaiser-Hill, provides Site protective forces and other security related services and is accountable to Kaiser-Hill for the safe performance of work.

3/19/99

DWRC, RFEC, FWENC, and OHM as AE/CCM Subcontractors to Kaiser-Hill, provide various architect and engineering services, construction and construction management (design/build) services to the Principal Subcontractors. Typical projects may include tasks for nuclear and non-nuclear facilities, special nuclear facilities and associated D&D activities. Each AE/CCM is accountable to Kaiser-Hill for the safe performance of work.

The project manager for project activities which are performed by other subcontractors, including Principal Subcontractors, retains the authority to perform oversight, surveillances, and assessments of subcontractor activities and provide direction to subcontractors as deemed necessary by the project manager to assure completion of work in accordance with QA Program requirements. Specific interfaces among project management and subcontractor organizations are to be identified in appropriate documents.

6.3 **Responsibilities**

The principal responsibilities for individuals and organizations implementing the *Kaiser-Hill Team QAP* are identified in the *Rocky Flats Closure Project Functions and Responsibilities Document*. The following is a brief identification of the general responsibilities of major Kaiser-Hill Team members as well as specific responsibilities of some organizations integral to the Quality Assurance Program:

6.3.1 The Kaiser-Hill President is responsible for:

- Approving overall policy and management direction for the Kaiser-Hill Team QAP.
- Approving allocation of resources to implement QA requirements.

6.3.2 All Kaiser-Hill Vice Presidents reporting to the Kaiser-Hill President are responsible for:

- Providing resources for their organizations necessary to implement the QA requirements, as applicable.
- Incorporating applicable QA requirements into documents that govern work, activities, and the procurement of items and services.
- Communicating applicable QA requirements to Principal Subcontractors and lower-tier contractors, as appropriate.
- Providing integration, coordination, and oversight (management assessments) of activities under their purview including those performed by subcontractors.
- Initiating the stop work process when appropriate.

3/19/99

- Ensuring effective implementation of the QA program, including continuous improvement.
- Management Assessment - Assessing the effective implementation of the Site QA Program.
- Taking timely corrective action for identified quality problems.

6.3.3 In addition to the responsibilities stated in 6.3.2, the Kaiser-Hill Vice President, Safety Systems and Engineering is responsible for:

- Establishing direction and guidance for defining, implementing, and maintaining the Site Design, Authorization Basis and Quality Assurance infrastructures.
- Resolving QA related problems not resolved at lower or peer organization level.
- Developing and maintaining the Site Corrective Actions Process, the Management Assessment Program, and the Independent Assessment Program.
- Establishing the Site Quality Council.

6.3.4 The Kaiser-Hill Quality Program Manager, under the Vice President, Safety Systems and Engineering, is responsible for:

- Identifying, documenting, and maintaining the QA requirements.
- Developing, preparing, and maintaining the Kaiser-Hill Team QAP to meet the requirements of 10 CFR 830.120 and DOE Order 5700.6C.
- Developing, coordinating, approving, and maintaining the *Site QA Manual*.
- Establishing, in coordination with the responsible implementing organizations, controls to ensure that conditions not in compliance with QA requirements are identified and promptly corrected.
- Providing Kaiser-Hill assistance, indoctrination, and training in QA practices, procedures, and regulations.
- Maintaining liaison with regulators regarding quality assurance
- Maintaining the Evaluated Subcontractors List
- Evaluating the implementation of the Site QA Program by Kaiser-Hill, the Principal Subcontractors and AE/CCMs through the conduct of Quality Audits
- Initiating the stop work process when appropriate.
- Chairing the Site Quality Council
- Conduct the Annual Quality Audit of for Site Implementation of the TRU and Low Level Waste Programs as required by the waste repositories.

3/19/99

6.3.5 The Site Quality Council, under the leadership and direction of the Kaiser-Hill Quality Program Manager as Chairperson, is responsible for:

- Serving as the Site interface with the DOE, RFFO quality organization on quality-related matters.
- Reviewing Site performance indicators, trend reports, assessment and audit reports, deficiency reports, quality problems and issues, and corrective actions, as appropriate.
- Advising senior management regarding actual and potential issues related to quality that may affect the Site's ability to accomplish its mission or that may impact the workers, the public or the environment.
- Assisting senior management by providing recommended actions for satisfying quality performance measures. Interacting with DOE and other oversight entities, as appropriate.

6.3.6 Principal Subcontractors and AE/C/CM Subcontractors (in accordance with their QAPP and task order requirements) are responsible for:

- Providing resources to implement the Site and company-specific QA requirements, as applicable.
- Implementing Site infrastructure programs and procedures, as applicable.
- Providing resources for the development and maintenance (when infrastructure procedures do not exist) of procedures and instructions to accomplish their company-specific missions.
- Communicating QA requirements to lower-tier contractors and suppliers and approving the QAPPs of their lower-tier contractors, when applicable.
- Assuring that appropriate quality assurance requirements are included in procurements under their purview
- Providing oversight of work performed by lower-tier and AE/CCM subcontractors in their area of responsibility.
- Providing company-specific organizational charts, functional responsibilities, levels of authority and updating as necessary.
- Performing management assessments of their respective quality related activities and reporting results to management.
- Tracking and providing timely corrective action for identified quality problems.
- Initiating the stop work process when appropriate.
- Reviewing quality data to determine measures to strengthen performance.
- Facilitating the resolution of quality-related problems.
- Conducting independent assessments within their company.

6.3.7 Individual Managers are responsible for:

- Providing timely corrective action for identified quality problems.
- Implementing Site infrastructure programs and procedures, as applicable.
- Ensuring that activities affecting quality are controlled by approved procedures or other appropriate means.
- Identifying and properly maintaining quality assurance records under their purview
- Assuring that personnel under their purview are properly trained and qualified to perform work assigned

6.3.8 The Site TRU Waste Project Quality Officer reports to the RMRS Quality Assurance Manager and reviews implementation of the Site *QAPjP* and verifies implementation of the QA requirements through:

- Developing, reviewing, approving, issuing, and maintaining the Site *QAPjP*
- Providing day-to day guidance on quality related matters, as necessary, to Project staff
- Identifying and reporting quality problems to the TRU Waste Project Manager and initiating, recommending, and tracking corrective actions to closure
- Reviewing and verifying that the data packages are complete
- Ensuring review and approval of disposition of project nonconformances
- Initiating a stop work order if quality work is not assured
- Ensuring that at least one independent assessment is performed annually and that surveillances are conducted as appropriate
- Tracking and trending Non Conformance Reports (NCRs)
- Implementing Quality Improvement for the TRU Waste
- Performing surveillances site-wide of compliance with the TRU Waste Program
- Reviewing the Kaiser-Hill Team, Principal Subcontractor and AE/CCM company-specific QAPs, to assure that these documents are in concert with the TRU Waste Program.

6.3.9 The Site LLW Waste Quality Officer reports to the RMRS Quality Assurance Manager and reviews the Site *Low-Level Waste Management Manual* and verifies implementation of the QA requirements contained therein through:

- Reviewing, approving, and maintaining the QA requirements in the Site *Low-Level Waste Management Manual*.
- Providing day-to-day guidance on quality related matters, as necessary to the Low-Level Waste management staff.

3/19/99

- Identifying and reporting quality problems to the Low-Level Waste Project Manager and initiating, recommending, and tracking corrective actions to closure.
- Reviewing and verifying that the data packages are complete
- Reviewing and approving the disposition of project non conformances
- Initiating a stop work order if quality work is not assured
- Ensuring that at least one independent assessment is performed annually and that surveillances are conducted as appropriate.
- Tracking and trending Non Conformance Reports (NCRs)
- Implementing Quality Improvement for the LLW Waste Program
- Performing surveillances site-wide of compliance with the LLW Waste Program

7.0 SITE QUALITY ASSURANCE PROGRAM

The remainder of this document is divided into three subsections that correspond to the criteria of 10 CFR 830.120(c) and DOE Order 5700.6C.

Section 5 of the *Quality Assurance Program Manual, Quality Assurance Program Infrastructure Document List*, contains a list of the Site Level implementing documents for each of the criteria. [[Note: The *Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site Transuranic Waste Characterization Program, Quality Assurance Program Description Matrix (INS-246)* is a separate document that provides a cross walk of DOE CAO-94-1012 quality requirements to applicable Site documents. The *Low Level Waste Management Plan, Appendix 5, Implementation Matrix for Quality Assurance Requirements* provides a crosswalk of Nevada Test Site quality assurance requirements for waste acceptance with applicable Site documents.]]

7.1 Management

7.1.1 Criterion 1, Program

7.1.1.1 Requirements

10 CFR 830.120 (c) (1) (i) for Nuclear Facilities/Activities
"A written quality assurance program (QAP) shall be developed, implemented, and maintained. The QAP shall describe the organizational structure, functional responsibilities, levels of authority and interfaces for those managing, performing, and assessing the work. The QAP shall describe management processes, including planning, scheduling, and resource considerations."

3/19/99

DOE Order , 9. b.(1)(a) for Non-Nuclear Activities

“Organizations shall develop, implement, and maintain a written Quality Assurance Program (QAP). The QAP shall describe the organizational structure, functional responsibilities, levels of authority, and interfaces for those managing, performing, and assessing adequacy of work. The QAP shall describe the management system, including planning, scheduling, and cost control considerations.”

7.1.1.2 Discussion

The *Site Quality Assurance Manual*, which contains the *Kaiser-Hill Team QAP*, is developed, implemented, maintained, and approved by the IMC. Each Principal Subcontractor is required to work to the QA requirements.

The Kaiser-Hill Team QAP is consistent with *DOE G-830.120-Rev. 0, Implementation Guide for use with 10 CFR 830.120 Quality Assurance Requirements*.

The individual company-specific QAPPs of the Principal or AE/CCM Subcontractors is required to implement the requirements of the Kaiser-Hill Team QAP. The QAPPs and changes thereto are required to be approved by Kaiser- Hill. All of the four Principal Subcontractor QAPPs and the four AE/CCM Subcontractor QAPPs are approved. Subcontractor QAPPs will apply the Kaiser-Hill QAP requirements to their subcontracted work, whether performed by the Subcontractor or a lower-tier contractor. The lower-tier contractor may work to the QAPP of the Subcontractor, or they may develop their own QAPP as long as their Plan is consistent with the Subcontractor's QAPP and has been approved by the responsible Subcontractor. Any exceptions taken to established Site infrastructure identified in the Kaiser-Hill Team QAP shall be identified in the QAPP and an alternate approach defined when the requirement is applicable to the Subcontractor. In addition, since AE/CCM Subcontractors perform work to individual task orders, their QAPPs specify how specific task order QA Program requirements are addressed to assure compliance with all applicable requirements.

The Kaiser-Hill Team in cooperation with DOE, RFFO has developed a Closure Project Baseline (CPB) showing achievement of the RFCA interim end-state (interim closure) by the year 2010. The CPB was built on the work done in developing the Accelerate Site Action Project (ASAP), Workouts II and III, the *Accelerating Closure: Focus on 2006 document*, the FY97 work plan, and the FY98/99 work plan. The CPB brought all of these activities under a single umbrella.

3/19/99

During FY98 Kaiser-Hill has focused on validation of the CPB and the development of innovative strategies to achieve Site closure by 2006. Accelerated Site closure will impact the quality assurance program in two areas. Since much of the acceleration effort involves the identification and implementation of cost savings achieved through the streamlining of currently accepted work practices, regulatory requirements, and resource requirements, quality assurance organizations will need to assure that reductions in these areas remain commensurate with the current risk at the Site. Quality-related organizations will also need to maintain cognizance of CPB changes to ensure resources are adequate as annual funding, yearly work progress, and Stakeholder concerns change. Quality organizations helping to facilitate the integration of quality requirements at the Work Authorization Document (WAD) level will help to ensure that work scope and activities over the closure project life-cycle are necessary and sufficient with respect to implementation of quality requirements.

The CPB is a key project management tool for the closure project. It documents the approved plan (work scope, schedule, and estimated cost) for project execution according to a work breakdown structure (WBS), with Project Baseline Descriptions (PBD) providing detailed scope statements, schedules, and cost estimates. The CPB undergoes minor update as baseline change proposals are approved during the year. Major baseline updates occur early each calendar year as the CPB is refined to support DOE Field Budget Submission and annual work plan requirements based on projected funding levels provided by DOE, RFFO. Each year, a two-year window of the CPB is expanded to greater detail to form the annual work plan, which becomes the basis of authorization by DOE, RFFO for execution year funding. All changes to the baseline are governed by rigorous change control procedures.

In FY98 Kaiser-Hill delivered to DOE, RFFO the *Accelerating Closure: Focus on 2006* document. This document was forwarded by DOE, RFFO to DOE Headquarters Environmental Management (EM) to become a part of a complex-wide plan to facilitate an integrated approach to waste treatment, material disposition, and other areas whose optimal solution may not be achievable on an individual site basis. Current plans call for annual updates to the *Focus on 2006* document.

The approved annual work plan is the official execution year baseline. The scope, schedule, and budget for this baseline is contained in the WADs, and becomes the basis for performance measurement and earned-value during the current fiscal year.

3/19/99

Kaiser-Hill planning and project management activities follow the defined DOE budgeting and project management processes, both for current year work plan development and outyear planning. Execution year budget authorizations are formally documented and maintained under formal configuration controls.

The *Kaiser-Hill Team QAP* describes the programmatic elements and Site infrastructure used for implementing QA requirements. The Site infrastructure provides for the development of program documents and procedures needed to satisfy the requirements of rules, regulations, and DOE Orders that are applicable to Site activities. The Site basic organizational structure, functional responsibilities, lines of authorities, and interfaces are described in Section 6 of this document, *Organizational Roles and Responsibilities*, and detailed in the *Rocky Flats Closure Project Functions and Responsibilities Document*. Policies applicable to the IMC, and Principal Subcontractors are found in the *Policy Manual*, and are developed and maintained in accordance with the Policy Program.

The document hierarchy, which includes the QAP, is described in Section 5.3, *Document Hierarchy*, and illustrated in Figure 1, *Site Quality Document Hierarchy*.

Site work planning, work authorization, and implementation of QA requirements are accomplished through the establishment of policies, programs, procedures, and work instructions. Procedures that implement the activities are written, to satisfy the criteria according to the risk(s), hazard(s), and/or consequence(s) identified, and reviewed and approved by the appropriate level of management. The QAP provides the graded approach criteria, while the SDRM describes the controls to assure the criteria are considered when developing implementing procedures. The *ISMS Manual* integrates these procedures to identify the controls to be applied when determining the prevention or mitigation of the consequences of hazards. A list of Site level infrastructure documents that implement the Site QA requirements is found in the *Site QA Manual*.

Quality is achieved by the individuals who are responsible for producing an item or performing an activity. Quality may be measured by acceptance criteria, technical evaluations, inspections, management assessments, and independent assessments.

Deficiencies and nonconformances are documented and, based on their significance, corrective actions are formulated, documented, implemented, and selectively verified to prevent recurrence. Significance criteria are

3/19/99

established in the *Site Corrective Action Requirements Manual, 1-MAN-012-SCARM (SCARM)*.

7.1.1.3 Implementing Documents

Documents, or applicable portions, that are used to direct the implementation of QA requirements include: the *Site QA Manual*; the *Rocky Flats Closure Project Functions and Responsibilities Document*; *1-MAN-022-PAAAPROG, Price-Anderson Amendments Act Program*; *1-R97-F&A-MCS-001, Management Control System*; *1-40-ADM-MCS-1002, Work Package Development and Documentation*; *1-C40-QAP-02.01, Preparation of Quality Assurance Program Plans*; the *Site Quality Assurance Program Procedures Manual*; the *IWCP Manual*; the *SDRM*; and the *SCARM*.

7.1.2 Criterion 2, Personnel Training and Qualification

7.1.2.1 Requirements

10 CFR 830.120 (c) (1) (ii) for Nuclear Facilities/Activities

"Personnel shall be trained and qualified to ensure they are capable of performing their assigned work. Personnel shall be provided continuing training to ensure that job proficiency is maintained."

DOE Order , 9. b.(1)(b) for Non-Nuclear Activities

"Personnel shall be trained and qualified to ensure they are capable of performing their assigned work. Personnel shall be provided continuing training to ensure that job proficiency is maintained."

7.1.2.2 Discussion

Training programs, including initial training, are designed to qualify and train personnel responsible for managing, developing, performing, and assessing work activities. Continuing training is provided to ensure job proficiency is maintained.

The qualification and training process is designed to enable management to determine and document job-specific and general training requirements for their employees. Training methods include formal training conducted by qualified instructors, briefings conducted by management-approved personnel, required readings, workshops, seminars, and awareness training. Implementation requirements and responsibilities for personnel training and qualification are documented.

The training and qualification process is applied using a graded approach. For example, training of maintenance crafts will be focused on safety and other regulatory required training (e.g., Occupational Safety and Health Administration requirements). Other maintenance training and qualification will be limited to maintaining craft job proficiency at the journeyman level.

7.1.2.3 Implementation Documents

The *Training User's Manual* (TUM), implements the requirements of DOE Order 5480.20A, *Personnel Selection, Qualification, and Training Requirements at DOE Nuclear Facilities*. The TUM references the Site organization, and the planning and administration of the qualification/certification program, and sets forth the responsibilities, authorities, and methods for conducting training. The *Training Implementation Matrix* documents compliance to DOE Order 5480.20A for each nuclear facility. Company-specific procedures for training and training services are developed to support the TUM, including 10 CFR 830.120.

The training program includes general employee training which covers general requirements applicable to common elements of employees' work assignments. Personnel may also be required to complete area-specific training, based on their specific work area, building assignments, and access needs.

A matrix for line management to determine the general training requirements for each individual is available electronically. Employees may also be required to complete job-specific training in the unique aspects of individual jobs. Continuing training programs are designed and implemented to maintain and enhance job proficiency identified in the certification/qualification program. Line managers are responsible to incorporate applicable quality assurance program elements, codes, standards, and procedures into developed training or provide as additional training.

For TRU Waste related activities the Site Training process is supplemented by the *TRU Waste Characterization Project Training Implementation Plan* which is maintained by the TRU Waste organization and is referenced in the *TRU Waste Management Manual*.

3/19/99

7.1.3 Criterion 3, Quality Improvement

7.1.3.1 Requirements

10 CFR 830.120 (c)(1)(iii) for Nuclear Facilities/Activities

"Processes to detect and prevent quality problems shall be established and implemented. Items, services, and processes that do not meet established requirements shall be identified, controlled, and corrected according to the importance of the problem and the work affected. Correction shall include identifying the causes of problems and working to prevent recurrence. Item characteristics, process implementation, and other quality-related information shall be reviewed and the data analyzed to identify items, services, and processes needing improvement."

DOE Order, 9.b.(1)(c) for Non-Nuclear Activities

"The organization shall establish and implement processes to detect and prevent quality problems and to ensure quality improvement. Items and processes that do not meet established requirements shall be identified, controlled, and corrected. Correction shall include identifying the causes of problems and preventing recurrence. Item reliability, process implementation, and other quality-related information shall be reviewed and the data analyzed to identify items and processes needing improvement."

7.1.3.2 Discussion

Infrastructure programs have been established and implemented to detect, prevent, and correct quality related problems.

The Corrective Action Program at the Site includes various identification and reporting processes, each developed and implemented in order to satisfy specific laws, requirements, or regulations. Although these processes contain many corrective action program elements, they individually do not satisfy all the requirements of umbrella requirements and laws, such as the Rule and Order. As a result, the Site deficiency identification and reporting processes are required to follow the SCARM and its implementing procedures in order to assure that deficiencies are uniformly prioritized, tracked and trended, and that the minimum corrective action elements are met. The Plant Action Tracking System (PATs) is the approved Site tracking system.

Those items and activities that do not meet established criteria and/or predetermined quality requirements are identified, documented, analyzed, dispositioned, corrected, and selectively verified in accordance with the Site nonconforming items process. Nonconforming items are controlled to prevent

3/19/99

inadvertent installation, testing, or use. Based upon the importance to safety and the significance of the identified problem, causal factors are evaluated to establish the cause.

The occurrence reporting process establishes reporting requirements, follow-up corrective actions, and root cause analysis for events which could affect the health and safety of the public, could seriously impact the intended purpose for the Site facilities, could endanger the health and safety of the workers, or have a noticeable adverse effect on the environment.

Significance is determined based on potential impact to operations, safety, security, reliability, performance, regulatory compliance, and the environment.

Verification and follow-up activities are performed on selected corrective actions depending, in part, upon the significance of the identified deficiency. When conditions require immediate cessation of activities, the stop work process is initiated.

Management assessments provide a consistent approach for management to evaluate compliance with requirements and commitments, measure effectiveness of established processes, identify and correct deficient conditions and work practices, and to implement needed improvements. Item characteristics, process implementation, and other quality-related information and data will be reviewed and the data analyzed to identify items, services, and processes needing improvement based upon a graded approach. Trending of maintenance history data will be accomplished for specific buildings and equipment based upon a graded approach. The Cause Analysis process is established to determine the root and contributing causes of events and conditions, and the associated corrective actions, that if implemented, will prevent or minimize the possibility of recurrence. The rigor of cause analysis is based on the significance of the issue.

The Site Lessons Learned/Generic Implications Program is established to collect, evaluate, and distribute experience information related to concerns, deficiencies, occurrences, findings, defects, weaknesses, or other information with generic implications.

7.1.3.3 Implementation Documents

The quality improvement process is described and implemented, in part and as applicable, by several procedures. The Site corrective action process is defined in the SCARM. The SCARM establishes the process and responsibilities for identification, documentation, characterization,

3/19/99

categorization, and significance screening of deficiencies, management directives, and Site improvements.

Procedure 1-A65-ADM-15.01, *Control of Nonconforming Items*, establishes the process and responsibilities for identifying, controlling, resolving, modifying, evaluating, dispositioning, and verifying completed corrective actions for nonconforming items associated with non weapons applications. Procedure 2-U76-WC-4030, *Control of Waste Nonconformances*, is used for identifying, controlling, resolving, evaluating, providing dispositions, and verifying completed corrective actions for nonconforming waste items and packages at the Site.

Other procedures or applicable portions, that are used to identify and implement improvements are: 1-MAN-017-LLGI-RM, *Site Lessons Learned/Generic Implications Requirements Manual*; 1-MAN-022-PAAAPROG, *Price-Anderson Amendments Act*, 1-V10-ADM-15.02, *Stop Work Action*; 1-D97-ADM-16.01, *Occurrence Reporting Process*; 1-E93-ADM-16.18, *Data Analysis and Trending for Performance Improvement*; 1-MAN-075-SMM, *Standards Management Manual*; and 1-MAN-013-SIOM, *Site Integrated Oversight Manual*.

7.1.4 Criterion 4, Documents and Records

7.1.4.1 Requirements

10 CFR 830.120 (c)(1)(iv) for Nuclear Facilities/Activities

"Documents shall be prepared, reviewed, approved, issued, used, and revised to prescribe processes, specify requirements, or establish design. Records shall be specified, prepared, reviewed, approved, and maintained."

DOE Order , 9.b.(1)(d) for Non-Nuclear Activities

"Documents shall be prepared, reviewed, approved, issued, used, and revised to prescribe processes, specify requirements, or establish design. Records shall be specified, prepared, reviewed, approved, and maintained."

7.1.4.2 Discussion

The SDRM provides the methodology and requirements for controlling and developing Site documents. These documents include policies, management directives, manuals, procedures, instructions, and job aids.

The SDRM identifies the type, purpose, applicability, and signature requirements for the different Site-applicable document types.

When a procedure is selected as the correct document type, then a graded approach is applied to specify the rigor and level of activity by which the applicable set of standards and requirements are met. A re-engineering effort is currently reviewing the SDRM process for further refinement.

Kaiser-Hill provides the Site Document Control, Records Management, and Emergency Preparedness Programs. Engineering Document Control is provided by RMRS. Principal Subcontractors are responsible for assuring adherence to the Site Document Control and Records Management Programs through their company-specific QAPPs.

The Site Document Control Program is designed such that Site documents to prescribe processes, specify requirements, or establish design are prepared, reviewed, approved, issued, and controlled for use by personnel managing or performing work. Controlled documents are distributed to the user in a manner to ensure the use of the latest revision; controlled to ensure that obsolete and superseded documents are stamped, destroyed, or recalled to prevent their inadvertent use; routinely verified to ensure controlled status, and maintained by indices.

A Records Management Program has been established to ensure that Site records providing evidence of quality are specified, prepared, reviewed, approved, authenticated, legible, transferred, collected, maintained, stored, retained to identified retention periods, and indexed for accountability and retrievability. The scope of records to be retained is normally identified by line management within the procedure that generates the record. The Records Management organization provides assistance to Site organizations in the determination of records and appropriate retention schedules.

Computer hardware and software that are used to store, maintain, index, and access records are controlled to ensure records protection from loss or damage, and to ensure accountability and retrievability.

7.1.4.3 Implementation Documents

Correspondence is controlled in accordance with procedure *1-11000-ADM-003, Correspondence Control Program*, (to be superseded by *1-L43-IMS-001*, same title). Documents are reviewed for appropriate technical content and accuracy in accordance with SDRM. Manuals and procedures are distributed and controlled in accordance with procedure *1-MAN-063-DC, Document Control Program*.

3/19/99

Records generated by the Kaiser-Hill Team are controlled in accordance with procedure *1-V41-RM-001, Records Management Guidance for Records Sources*. The procedure establishes the requirements and responsibilities of Site records sources for the identification, generation, correction, authentication, protection, and turnover of records, regardless of media type, to the Site Records Management organization. The SDRM requires the consideration of and the inclusion of records requirements in the preparation of procedures and instructions.

For those records associated with TRU waste, *1-V41-RM-001* is supplemented by *1-PRO-077-WIPP-005, Management of WIPP Information Prior to Transmittal to the WIPP Project File*.

7.2 Performance

7.2.1 Criterion 5, Work Processes

7.2.1.1 Requirements

10 CFR 830.120 (c)(2)(i) for Nuclear Facilities/Activities

“Work shall be performed to established technical standards and administrative controls using approved instructions, procedures, or other appropriate means. Items shall be identified and controlled to ensure their proper use. Items shall be maintained to prevent their damage, loss, or deterioration. Equipment used for process monitoring or data collection shall be calibrated and maintained.”

DOE Order 5700.6, 9.b.(2)(a) for Non-Nuclear Activities

“Work shall be performed to established technical standards and administrative controls. Work shall be performed under controlled conditions using approved instructions, procedures, or other appropriate means. Items shall be identified and controlled to ensure their proper use. Items shall be maintained to prevent their damage, loss, or deterioration. Equipment used for process monitoring or data collection shall be calibrated and maintained.”

7.2.1.2 Discussion

Work processes and activities, including special processes, are performed as established by Site infrastructure programs and procedures such as the ISMS, SDRM and COEM. Principal Subcontractor QAPPs addresses all 10 CFR 830.120 and DOE 5700.6C criterion and requirements as applicable to their scope. AE/CCM Subcontractor QAPPs address the quality program requirements as specified in their contract. In addition, since AE/CCM

Subcontractors perform work to individual task orders, their QAPPs specify how specific task order QA Program requirements are addressed to assure compliance with all applicable requirements.

Controls for work processes affecting quality are identified through the ISMS. The documents which implement the controls to do the work are defined through the SDRM, IWCP and COOP processes, which result in the establishment of instructions, procedures, drawings, training requirements, and other approved means. Proceduralized infrastructure programs and process control systems have been established and continue to evolve (e.g., introduction of the ISMS and SDRM) to assure standardized and consistent achievement of requirements, goals, and objectives.

Individual employees and line management are responsible for the achievement of quality. Line managers ensure that activities affecting quality are controlled by approved procedures or other appropriate means.

The extent of the controls applied to the work is commensurate with the scope, complexity, and risk associated with the assigned task. Corrective, preventive, and predictive maintenance will be accomplished for specific equipment based upon a graded approach. Not all items will be maintained to prevent damage and deterioration. Equipment used for monitoring or data collection is calibrated and maintained. Line management observes work performed, reviews work documentation, conducts management assessments, and ensures documentation and correction of deficiencies and nonconformances. Activities affecting quality are controlled through approved documents, (e.g., procedures, work packages, subcontracts and task orders, activity control envelopes, design packages, etc.).

The Site Measuring and Test Equipment (M&TE) Program provides controls to calibrate and maintain M&TE. The CSS Metrology organization provides administrative and technical expertise for Site calibration organizations. Metrology also develops requirements for the control of M&TE. Organizations that are responsible for the M&TE implement requirements for control. M&TE includes measuring and testing instruments, standards, reference materials, and auxiliary apparatus that are necessary to perform a measurement in the course of testing, inspection, or calibration.

7.2.1.3 Implementation Documents

Prior to April 1998, work on site was authorized using the Master Activity List (MAL). The MAL contains a list of identified work activities which are either (1) a baseline activity necessary for performance due to the presence of

3/19/99

hazards, (2) a mission program activity authorized for performance, (3) a mission program activity authorized for planning only, or (4) a currently unauthorized mission program activity. The MAL contains the list of approved nuclear activities; however, not every listed activity is a nuclear activity. The MAL is currently being phased out as a work authorization tool. In April 1998, changes/updates to the MAL were suspended as the Principal Subcontractors began direct utilization of facility authorization bases and/or other work control tools (such as the Integrated Safety Management System) for work authorization.

Activities affecting quality are controlled through approved documents. Policies, management directives, manuals, procedures, instructions and job aids are controlled by the SDRM which provides a documented system for document preparation, review, change, revision, and approval. The COEM and the SERM provide a documented process for engineering document (e.g., drawings and specifications) preparation, review, revision, approval, and controlled distribution.

Work planning and control is implemented through the Integrated Safety Management System using the IWCP and Activity Screening process.

Maintenance work activities are implemented through several procedures including the IWCP; the Nuclear Safety Program; *Welding Program N-W86-WO-001*; the *Quality Control Manual for the Repair and Alteration of Boilers and Pressure Vessels to the National Board Inspection Code*; and the welding programs of each of the Principal Subcontractors (including 4-VO5-SSOC-WELD [SSOC], 95-ENG-WELD-052 [RMRS] and 1-W86-WELD-001 [CSS]).

Operations work is governed by the procedures found in the *COOP Manual*. The Radiological Control Manual governs radiological work. Other work is governed by the Waste Management Program, the Nuclear Control and Accountability Process, the Emergency Preparedness Program, the Procurement Program, M&TE procedures, etc.

A list of the Site level infrastructure documents that implement the Site QA requirements is found in the Kaiser-Hill Team *Quality Assurance Manual*. [Note: The *Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site Transuranic Waste Characterization Program, Quality Assurance Program Description Matrix (INS-246)* is a separate document that provides a cross walk of DOE CAO-94-1012 quality requirements to applicable Site documents. The *Low Level Waste Management Plan, Appendix 5, Implementation Matrix for Quality Assurance*

3/19/99

Requirements provides a crosswalk of Nevada Test Site quality assurance requirements for waste acceptance with applicable Site documents.]

7.2.2 Criterion 6, Design

7.2.2.1 Requirements

10 CFR 830.120 (c)(2)(ii) for Nuclear Facilities/Activities

"Items and processes shall be designed using sound engineering/scientific principles and appropriate standards. Design work, including changes, shall incorporate applicable requirements and design bases. Design interfaces shall be identified and controlled. The adequacy of design products shall be verified or validated by individuals or groups other than those who performed the work. Verification and validation work shall be completed before approval and implementation of the design."

DOE Order , 9.b.(2)(b) for Non-Nuclear Activities

"Items and processes shall be designed using sound engineering/scientific principles and appropriate standards. Design work, including changes, shall incorporate applicable requirements and design bases. Design interfaces shall be identified and controlled. The adequacy of design products shall be verified or validated by individuals or groups other than those who performed the work. Verification and validation work shall be completed before approval and implementation of the design."

7.2.2.2 Discussion

Kaiser-Hill provides engineering oversight for the Site. Principal and AE/CCM Subcontractors perform design in accordance with their subcontracts and task orders that establish the Quality Assurance Program requirements. Design requirements upon which final design work is based include inputs such as existing design bases, performance requirements, regulatory requirements, codes, standards, environmental considerations, risk, and interfaces with new or existing structures and equipment.

The design program provides controls for design of items and processes using engineering/scientific principles and appropriate standards. Design work includes the identification of the AB and consideration of nuclear materials safety. Design work includes incorporation of applicable requirements and design bases, identification and control of design interfaces, and verification and validation of the adequacy of design products by individuals or groups other than those who performed the work. The verification and validation is completed before approval and implementation of the design.

3/19/99

Design control applies to items, facilities, and processes and is documented and implemented through procedures, design packages, and work packages. Computer hardware and software elements are treated as a unit for the purpose of configuration control.

Software management is controlled in accordance with procedure *1-MAN-004-CSMM Rev. 0, Computer Software Management Manual*. Activities covered shall include the entire period of time known as the hardware and software life cycle. Activities shall include conception, requirements document, acquisition, development, design, verification and validation, configuration management, testing, documentation, use or operation, maintenance and/or modification, and sometimes a retirement phase.

Configuration accounting shall be documented and identify the approved configuration, status, proposed changes to the configuration, status of approved changes, and information to support the functions of the configuration identification, and configuration control.

The responsibility for ensuring software QA resides with the individual company or department that maintains the software. Specific activities and responsibilities for complying with these requirements are to be detailed in each individual company's SQA Compliance Procedure(s) or Software QA Plan(s).

7.2.2.3 Implementation Documents

Primary design controls are established, as applicable, within the COEM; the SERM; *Engineering Drafting Manual*, the *IWCP Manual*; the *Computer Software Management Manual*, *1-MAN-004-CSMM*; and the *Nuclear Safety Manual*, *1-MAN-018-NSM*. Procedure *1-V51-COEM-DES-210, Design Process Requirements*, identifies how to apply engineering controls as a function of risk. Additional procedures include: *Nuclear Materials Safeguards Manual*; *1-C10-NSM-04.03, Safety Evaluation Screen*; *1-C11-NSM-04.05, Unreviewed Safety Question Determination*; and *1-52000-ADM-02.01, Operation Review Committee Requirements*.

3/19/99

7.2.3 Criterion 7, Procurement

7.2.3.1 Requirements

10 CFR 830.120 (c)(2)(iii) for Nuclear Facilities/Activities

"Procured items and services shall meet established requirements and perform as specified. Prospective suppliers shall be evaluated and selected on the basis of specified criteria. Processes to ensure that approved suppliers continue to provide acceptable items and services shall be established and implemented."

DOE Order, 9.b.(2)(c) for Non-Nuclear Activities

"The organizations shall ensure that procured items and services meet established requirements and perform as specified. Prospective suppliers shall be evaluated and selected on the basis of specified criteria. The organization shall ensure that approved suppliers can continue to provide acceptable items and services."

7.2.3.2 Discussion

The IMC provides the Site with one common Procurement System for the procurement of commodities, items, and services; however, each of the Principal and AE/CCM Subcontractors maintain an individual procurement functions to process specific procurement documents. The Site procurement process provides a planned and controlled approach to procurement activities to ensure procured items and services conform to specified requirements. Procurement documents contain the technical, quality, and acceptance requirements for the procurement of items and services. The procurement process ensures that prospective suppliers are evaluated and selected on the basis of specified criteria.

Kaiser-Hill has specific contracts with each Principal Subcontractor which identify full scope QA program requirements. AE/CCM Subcontractor QA program requirements are defined through contract with Kaiser-Hill and specific task orders.

The procurement process also contains controls for technical, quality, and acceptance requirements to flow down to suppliers and lower-tier contractors. Included in this flow down are applicable Price-Anderson Amendments Act requirements. Kaiser-Hill Procurement Quality Assurance evaluates suppliers for Site Subcontractors, maintains the Site Evaluated Subcontractors List, investigates supplier issues leading to resolution, and represents the Site to the DOE contractor's Supplier Quality Information Group.

3/19/99

Procurement specifications for equipment, commodities, and services are developed in accordance with *1-W36-APR-111, Acquisition Procedure for Requisition of Commodities and Services*. *COEM-DES-273, Engineering Standards for Procurement* specifies the application of technical and quality requirements to be included in the procurement specifications including product specifications and controls to preclude the procurement of suspect/counterfeit material. Procurement requisitions in support of work packages are initiated through the Integrated Work Control Program.

Kaiser-Hill is responsible for evaluating suppliers Quality Assurance programs and maintaining the Kaiser-Hill Evaluated Subcontractors List in accordance with *1-J55-ADM-08.01, Supplier Quality Evaluations*. Kaiser-Hill Analytical Program Office is responsible for evaluating suppliers of analytical services. Kaiser-Hill Procurement Quality Assurance is responsible for evaluating suppliers of commodities and services other than analytical services. In addition, Principal Subcontractors may perform their own supplier evaluations of vendors using Site procedures and processes. RMRS is currently the only such company performing such supplier evaluations.

CSS is typically responsible for Site receipt, inspection, and certification. Receipt inspection and certification activities for procured items are conducted to verify compliance with the procurement documents. These activities include selected inspections, review of required documentation, selected testing, and ensuring the appropriate generation and closure of nonconformance documents.

The Customer Services Organization (CSO) in RMRS is responsible for the coordination of the procurement of waste commodities for the Site. In this role, CSO ensures that design is reviewed by subject matter experts in the LLW and TRU Projects for conformance with WIPP and NTS and other waste repository site waste acceptance criteria. They also ensure that commodities are used for the correct application depending on type of waste. The CSO coordinates with the RMRS Quality Assurance organization to ensure that the appropriate quality requirements are incorporated in the procurement documents and with the Site Procurement organization in CSS to effect the procurement, receiving inspection and storage of waste requirements.

7.2.3.3 Implementation Documents

Procurement requirements are implemented in accordance with the *Procurement System Volumes I, II, and III* and procedure *1-W36-APR-111, Acquisition Procedure for Requisitioning Commodities and Services*, which replaced Standing Order 30.

3/19/99

7.2.4 Criterion 8, Inspection and Acceptance Testing

7.2.4.1 Requirements

10 CFR 830.120 (c)(2)(iv) for Nuclear Facilities/Activities

"Inspection and testing of specified items, services, and processes shall be conducted using established acceptance and performance criteria. Equipment used for inspections and tests shall be calibrated and maintained."

DOE Order, 9.b.(2)(d) for Non-Nuclear Activities

"Inspection and acceptance testing of specified items and processes shall be conducted using established acceptance and performance criteria. Equipment used for inspections and tests shall be calibrated and maintained."

7.2.4.2 Discussion

Site infrastructure programs provide for inspection, testing, and calibration of specified items, services, and processes to demonstrate that items and processes perform as intended. Procedure *1-PRO-072-001, Inspection and Acceptance Test Process* specifies inspection and test requirements applicable to the Site. The procedure provides a graded approach for determining when inspections and tests are required. Inspection, testing, and calibration are conducted using established acceptance and performance criteria. Equipment used for inspections and tests is calibrated and maintained. Inspections, testing, and calibration to verify conformance of an item to specified requirements and/or demonstrate satisfactory performance for service will be planned, documented, performed, and evaluated using a graded approach according to risk.

Controls are established and provide for documented methods to communicate the status of operations, equipment, and systems to affected personnel. The work package planning process specifies lock-out and tag-out situations and utilizes methods to convey the status of pre-operational and post-maintenance activities to promote the safe operation of equipment and systems. A formal return to service process following successful post-maintenance testing is established.

The status of operations is communicated through the Shift Relief and Turnover process, and the status of inspections and tests through Inspection, Test and Operating Status Control Boards strategically located within Site facilities.

3/19/99

The Site Measuring and Test Equipment Program and Site Metrology Program are provided by CSS, as well as field inspection support of applicable maintenance/construction work. The Site Metrology Program includes process, inline instruments as well as the standard Measuring and Test Equipment. Controls are provided so that inspection and acceptance testing, identified in the technical documents, is performed and documented as required and in accordance with procedures.

7.2.4.3 Implementation Documents

The inspection, testing, and calibration of specified items, services, and processes, including equipment, is controlled through the COEM, the SERM, the IWCP, and through the Procurement, Metrology, and Control of Measuring and Test Equipment programs. Applicable portions of the following documents implement this criterion: *1-PRO-072-001, Inspection and Acceptance Testing Process*; *SOP-0601, Construction and Maintenance Inspection*; *1-V51-COEM-DES-210, Design Process Requirements*; and *1-I97-ADM-12.01, Control of Measuring and Test Equipment*.

7.3 Assessments

7.3.1 Criterion 9, Management Assessment

7.3.1.1 Requirements

10 CFR 830.120 (c)(3)(i) for Nuclear Facilities/Activities

“Managers shall assess their management processes. Problems that hinder the organization from achieving its objectives shall be identified and corrected.”

DOE Order , 9.b.(3)(a) for Non-Nuclear Activities

“Management at all levels shall periodically assess the integrated quality assurance program and its performance. Problems that hinder the organization from achieving its objectives shall be identified and corrected.”

7.3.1.2 Discussion

Management assessment places emphasis on the use of human and material resources to achieve Site goals and objectives. Management assessments include an introspective evaluation to determine if the entire integrated management system effectively focuses on meeting Site and company goals. Self-evaluations or self-assessments are one form of management assessment. Other forms of management assessment include, but are not limited to, critiques, reviews, walkdowns, and appraisals.

The IMC and Principal Subcontractor management retain the overall responsibility for management assessments. Direct participation by managers is essential to assure that effective programs have been established and implemented. Managers conduct assessments of their processes to identify problems that may prevent the organization from achieving its goals and objectives. Problems detected by management assessments are documented and corrected in accordance with the SCARM.

7.3.1.3 Implementation Documents

Management assessments are conducted by Site organizations in accordance with *1-MAN-013-SIOM, Site Integrated Oversight Manual* (SIOM) and other approved procedures. Guidance applicable to the selection and prioritization of management assessment topics is contained in the appendices to *1-W37-IA-002, Integrated Planning and Scheduling of Independent Assessments*.

Compliance with DOE Orders and other standards is established and documented in accordance with procedure *1-MAN-075-SMM, Standards Management Manual*. Corrective action is taken in accordance with SCARM.

7.3.2 Criterion 10, Independent Assessment

7.3.2.1 Requirements

10 CFR 830.120 (c)(3)(ii) for Nuclear Facilities/Activities

"Independent assessments shall be planned and conducted to measure item and service quality, to measure the adequacy of work performance, and to promote improvement. The group performing independent assessments shall have sufficient authority and freedom from the line to carry out its responsibilities. Persons conducting independent assessments shall be technically qualified and knowledgeable in the areas assessed."

DOE Order , 9.b.(3)(b) for Non-Nuclear Activities

"Planned and periodic independent assessments shall be conducted to measure item quality and process effectiveness and to promote improvement. The organization performing independent assessments shall have sufficient authority and freedom from the line organization to carry out its responsibilities. Persons conducting independent assessments shall be technically qualified and knowledgeable in the areas assessed."

3/19/99

7.3.2.2 Discussion

The IMC is responsible for establishing direction and guidance for the Independent Assessment Program and performing independent oversight and assessments within the IMC and Principal Subcontractor organizations. Principal Subcontractors perform independent assessments within their specific company. Independent assessment activities are used to evaluate the performance of work processes with regard to requirements, expectations of the customer, and progress toward achieving the Site mission and goals. Independent assessment activities are conducted to assure the appropriate QA requirements are incorporated into Site work control processes and documents and are included in Site daily activities. Independent assessment activities evaluate floor level compliance with Site infrastructure programs and procedures. Independent assessment activities are documented and reports are provided to appropriate levels of management. Findings are used to evaluate effectiveness of the processes and identify needed improvements. Independent assessment concerns are tracked and follow-up actions taken to verify that corrective action is accomplished as scheduled in accordance with the SCARM.

Those performing independent assessment activities have sufficient authority and freedom to carry out their responsibilities. Persons performing independent assessment activities are technically qualified, knowledgeable in the areas assessed, and do not have direct responsibility in the areas assessed.

DOE requires that all contractors and their subcontractors allow access to all facility areas for the purpose of conducting assessment activities. To enhance the performance and efficiency of assessments, all employees, to the level of their knowledge and authority, provide requested information and documentation during the assessment process. For effective communication and where corrective action is necessary, management of the assessed organization(s) should participate in the assessment process.

7.3.2.3 Implementation Documents

Independent assessment activities are performed in accordance with SIOM. The SIOM establishes the objectives, program elements, and coordination instructions for independent assessment programs implemented by the Integrating Management Contractor and each of the Principal Subcontractors. The *Readiness Determination Manual, I-MAN-040-RDM*, provides requirements and guidance for planning and conducting readiness determinations. Corrective action is taken in accordance with the SCARM.

3/19/99

8.0 IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

All commitments in the *Kaiser-Hill Team Quality Assurance 10 CFR 830.120 Implementation Plan* have been reported complete. A copy of the Implementation Plan is available through the Kaiser-Hill Quality Program organization.

3/19/99

APPENDIX 1

Page 1 of 7

**Graded Approach To The Requirements
of 10 CFR 830.120**

The criteria of 10 CFR 830.120 are applied in a graded approach as described below:

- (1) Program - There is one Kaiser-Hill Team Quality Assurance Program. It describes the roles and responsibilities of the Kaiser-Hill Team and the principal documents that implement the QA requirements. Implementing documents (procedures) have been developed, as appropriate, to utilize a graded approach for implementing the QA requirements and procedural instructions. Strategic planning for the Kaiser-Hill Team has focused on reducing the risks and hazards in the various Site facilities in order to accomplish the most mission work possible within a reasonable time period and within an allocated budget. The documents that govern the graded approach process are the QAP, SDRM and the ISMS *Manual*. The QAP provides the graded approach criteria, while the SDRM describes the controls to assure the criteria are considered when developing implementing procedures. The *ISMS Manual* integrates these procedures to identify the controls to be applied when determining the prevention or mitigation of the consequences of hazards.
- (2) Personnel Training and Qualification - Requirements for the indoctrination, training, and continuing (refresher) training are commensurate with the scope, complexity, and nature of the assigned duties, or the activity, to be performed. The *Site Training Implementation Matrix* identifies the qualification and certification requirements by job designation for Site nuclear facilities. The *TRU Waste Characterization Project Training Implementation Plan* identifies the qualification and certification requirements by job designation for TRU waste related activities.
- (3) Quality Improvement - It is important that all deficient conditions and nonconforming items be identified; therefore, it is not appropriate to apply graded approach to their identification. Items that do not conform to requirements are controlled to prevent inadvertent installation or use. Graded approach is built into the corrective action process described by the SCARM. Each item that requires corrective action is evaluated and

3/19/99

APPENDIX 1

Page 2 of 7

ranked according to its significance. The higher the significance or risk level, the more rigorous are the required corrective action elements. In addition, the cause analysis procedure requires the more significant events to receive a more rigorous cause analysis. Based on significance and risk, item characteristics, process implementation and other quality related information for specific buildings or processes will be reviewed and data analyzed to identify items, services, and processes needing improvement.

- (4) Documents and Records - Graded approach is applied to the preparation, review, approval, issue, distribution, use, and revision of documents based on their relative importance, the intended recipients, the applicability of the document, and the need to know. The more important documents approach has limited application in the specification, preparation, review, approval, and maintenance of Site records. If a document is, or will become, a record, it is governed by the Records Management Program. Government records must meet the requirements of the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA). NARA dictates record maintenance and provides approved and graded retention schedules. In addition documents and records that support the shipment of TRU Waste to WIPP are maintained in accordance with *CAO-94-1012* and *CAO-94-1010*.
- (5) Work Processes - Graded approach is built into Site work processes through the infrastructure programs and procedures. These include but are not limited to, ISMS, SDRM, Policies and Procedures, Readiness Determinations, Configuration Management, Training and Qualification, Emergency Management, Security and Safeguards, Engineering, Maintenance, Conduct of Operations, Radiation Protection, Occurrence Reporting, Procurement, Waste Management, and Nuclear Safety. The Corrective Actions Process provides a mechanism for prioritizing and evaluating unclassified deficiencies, concerns, and improvements. A brief description of example work processes follows:

3/19/99

APPENDIX 1

Page 3 of 7

- Occurrence Reporting

Based on the reporting requirements established by DOE, Kaiser-Hill provides a graded approach to the implementation of DOE reporting requirements. Each event or occurrence is categorized by significance. The categories in descending order of significance are Emergency, Unusual Occurrence, Off-normal Occurrence, and Internally Reportable Occurrence. The first three categories are reported formally to DOE. The fourth category warrants notification of company management but not DOE. Occurrences that fall outside of these four categories do not require formal reporting. Grading is also built into the need to hold a fact-finding meeting and in the rigor of the cause analysis. If the facts are known and documented, a fact-finding meeting is not required. The rigor of the cause analysis and the resources to be applied to the cause analysis of an occurrence are dependent on the significance of the event and the potential risk the event or condition poses to the workers, the public, the environment, or the facility. Programmatic deficiencies which affect nuclear activities in accordance with 10 CFR 830.120, Quality Assurance Requirements, are reported to DOE via the nonconformance tracking system per *1-MAN-022-PAAAPROG, Price Anderson Amendments Act Program Manual*.

- Readiness Determinations

Site procedure *1-MAN-040-RDM, Readiness Determination Manual* that implements DOE Order 425.1, *Startup and Restart of Nuclear Facilities*, are documented in *1-H24-ADM-10.10, Startup and Restart of Nuclear Facilities Operational Readiness Reviews* and *1-U85-ADM-10.03, Startup and Restart of Nuclear Facilities/Programs Readiness Assessment/Management Review*. This Manual provide guidance in meeting the requirements for planning and conducting a Readiness Assessment (RA) when required by the conditions of a restart or activity as specified in the DOE Order 425.1. This manual also provides a methodology for determining the breadth and depth of the readiness determination consistent with the hazards and complexity of the proposed facility transition. In addition to grading the readiness assessment by breadth and depth, the procedures are also graded by applicability. The readiness determination requirements do not apply to facilities that are less than Hazard Category 3.

APPENDIX 1

Page 4 of 7

- Maintenance

The Integrated Work Control Program provides a corrective, preventive, and predictive maintenance process for Operations Managers to identify, report, evaluate, assign resolution responsibilities, and close out deficiencies, modifications, and work requests. The process provides a graded approach based primarily upon importance to safety and the magnitude of the hazards. The maintenance process distinguishes between emergency work and non-emergency work. It provides a graded approach using a single work package development process. Using seven phases to develop each work package, the level of formality of the work package will be established based upon the six criteria of DOE definition of graded approach. The process permits routine maintenance work (such as repair of water fountains and touch-up painting) to be performed without a work package. It also provides for the use of pre-approved Standard Work Packages for certain repetitive maintenance work. Not all items will be maintained to prevent their damage or deterioration.

- Procedures and Policies

The SDRM provides the methodology and requirements for controlling and developing Site documents such as procedures and manuals. Graded approach has not been incorporated to address the rigor required or the flexibility granted with respect to procedure format. However, the sitewide procedure development process incorporates graded approach in several other ways. The use of procedures is graded by four Use Categories. The Use Category determines whether the procedure must be in hand, memorized, or referenced. Administrative procedures are included in Use Category 4. The process governing revisions, modifications, and changes to procedures is graded by two levels of effort, non-intent changes and intent changes. Graded approach is also incorporated through phased implementation. The Kaiser-Hill Team has identified approximately 25 policies contained in the *Kaiser-Hill Policy Manual* that express broad fundamental core values, principles, and expectations of senior management regarding the direction of the Site and Site personnel.

3/19/99

APPENDIX 1

Page 5 of 7

- (6) Design - The design process utilizes a graded approach to system category classification to ensure that design, procurement, construction, repair and decommissioning activities are subject to appropriate levels of review and control commensurate with the safety function of the system, component, or part. System categories (SC) (1, 2, 3 or 4) are established based on the relative importance to safety and potential hazards commensurate with the function of the structures, systems, and components. Design activities include design inputs, analysis, interface control, verification, issue and change control. The four system categories ensure that appropriate resources are applied to all phases of design, construction, repair work, and decommissioning activities are subject to levels of review and control commensurate with the safety function of the system, component, or part. Many old as-built drawings are not current; therefore, before an as-built drawing is used as input for SC 1 and 2 design modification, the affected location must be walked-down and a field-verified drawing generated. SC 3 and 4 modifications require accurate information as to field conditions, but a walkdown is not a requirement. The design process utilizes the graded procurement process (three quality levels based on importance to safety, safeguards, security, and intended use) when ordering new or replacement parts. Design verification requirements are established using a graded approach based on importance to safety, the complexity of the design, and the use of the output. (For example: computer software program features used as tools to develop a preliminary model or used merely as an aid in reviewing results need not be verified. However, program outputs used as inputs for final analysis are independently verified correct for each calculation, analysis, evaluation, or model.)
- (7) Procurement - The procurement process uses Procurement Levels (1, 2, and 3) representing graded procurement controls which incorporate the level of quality necessary to ensure that procured items and services meet established requirements and perform as specified. Procurement Levels are used to define the method of procurement, and specify acceptance and requirements for purchased items and services. Suppliers used for Procurement Level 1 items and services are evaluated using a graded approach based on relative importance to safety, safeguards, and security. The graded approach applied during the design process provides input to the development of procurement/inspection specifications and determination of the appropriate Procurement Level.

3/19/99

APPENDIX 1

Page 6 of 7

Grading is also used by Engineering to specify the proper storage classification level (A, B, C, or D) in accordance with the procurement specification.

- (8) Inspection and Acceptance Testing - Inspection and testing of specified items, services, and processes are conducted in accordance with *1-PRO-072-001, Inspection and Acceptance Test Process*, utilizing established, acceptance and performance criteria. Engineering personnel determine inspection criteria and post-maintenance testing requirements for maintenance and modifications. Inspection criteria and post-maintenance testing requirements are identified in work control documents. Purchase requisitions identify the procurement level and the inspection requirements for procured items and services. Other than deciding whether inspection or post-maintenance testing is necessary, there is little grading that can be applied since inspections and post-maintenance testing requirements are based on national codes and technical standards.
- (9) Management Assessments - The management assessment process is graded in that it empowers individual senior managers of the Kaiser-Hill Team to direct the development and implementation of management assessment programs for their respective organizations. The programmatic mission of an organization, as it relates to the application of QA requirements, will determine the management assessments performed. The *SIOM* provides the programmatic framework for ensuring that an organization's management assessment program implements the management assessment requirement without being overly prescriptive or restrictive.

3/19/99

APPENDIX 1

Page 7 of 7

- (10) Independent Assessment - Independent assessments are planned and conducted to measure item and service quality, to measure the adequacy of work performance, and to promote improvement. Flexibility (grading) in meeting these objectives is prescribed by prioritizing the program, scheduling assessments, and allocating resources in accordance with importance to safety, status, risk, and complexity of the item or process being assessed. Emphasis is placed on elements of activities most important to safety and on the need to evaluate facility performance when allocating assessment resources. Reactive independent assessments are performed in response to management requests, building or equipment problems, occurrence reports, negative performance trends, or unsatisfactory performance indicators. It is not appropriate to apply graded approach to the requirement that the group performing independent assessments have sufficient authority and freedom from the line to carry out its responsibilities. This process is controlled by the *SIOM*.

Summary of Changes from Revision 7 of the Kaiser-Hill Team Quality Assurance Plan

| PAGE PARAGRAPH | SECTION | CHANGE | IMPACT TO QAP COMPLIANCE WITH 10 CFR 830.120 |
|----------------------|-----------------------|--|---|
| General | | QAP has been modified to reflect the replacement of DynCorp of Colorado, Inc. (DCI) by Rocky Flats Closure Site Services (CSS) | Reflects change in Subcontractors performing specific work scope only; does not change the quality requirements for the performance of the scope of work. |
| 10 | 4.0 | Corrected reference to 10 CFR 820 | Correction of reference. No impact |
| 10 | 4.0 | Added ASME NQA-3, 1989, <i>Quality Assurance Requirements for the Collection of Scientific and Technical Information for the Site Characterization of High Level Nuclear Repositories</i> to the list of technical standards | Previously existing requirement. No impact. |
| 10 | 4.0 | Added NQA-1-1994, Subpart 2.7, <i>Quality Assurance Requirements of Computer Software for Nuclear Facility Applications</i> | Previously existing requirement. No impact. |
| 11 paragraph 1 | 4.0 | Added reference to CAO-94-1010 and to the <i>Site Quality Program Criteria Document</i> | Clarification of previously existing requirement. No impact. |
| 11 paragraph 2 | 4.0 | Added paragraph regarding Principal and AE/CCM Subcontractor responsibility for communicating to their subcontractors that directly impact waste characterization, the performance requirements from and need to comply with CAO-94-1010 and CAO-94-1012 | States a previously existing Waste Program requirement. No impact. |
| 12 paragraph 3 | 5.1 | Modified to reflect work scope changes among Principal Subcontractors | Company work scope change; does not change quality requirements to which work is performed. |
| 13 paragraph 2 | 5.1 | Added note to reflect potential for reassignment of work among Principal and AE/CCM subcontractors. | Explains how modifications to work scope are handled with respect to the Kaiser-Hill Team Quality Program. |
| 13 last paragraph | 5.1 | Changed to reflect completion of the ISMS Implementation Plan | Reflects completion of ISMS Implementation Plan. Various verification efforts are ongoing to establish the implementation status of the individual companies. |
| 14 paragraph 2 | 5.1 | Changed to reflect cancellation of PRO-R32-ADM-02.30, <i>Activity Screening Process</i> and 1-D55-DADM-02.37, <i>Activity Control Envelope Development</i> | These procedures were replaced by publication of the Integrated Work Control Program Manual (MAN-071-IWCP) |
| 16 29 41-42 | 5.3 7.0 7.2.1.3 | Included reference to the Quality Assurance Program Description Procedures Matrix for TRU Waste and the Low-Level Waste Implementation Matrix | Provide reference for additional information. No impact. |
| 17 | 5.3.2 | Changed to reflect completion of commitments in the Kaiser-Team 10 CFR 830.120 Implementation Plan | No impact. Non-compliances with 10 CFR 830.120 are reported in accordance with the Site Price-Anderson Amendments Act Reporting process. |

Summary of Changes from Revision 7 of the Kaiser-Hill Team Quality Assurance Plan

| PAGE PARAGRAPH | SECTION | CHANGE | IMPACT TO QAP COMPLIANCE WITH 10 CFR 830.120 |
|---------------------------|----------------|--|--|
| 22 last paragraph | 5.5 | Added reference to 1-PRO-077-WIPP-006 | Provided for clarification/information. No impact. |
| 23 | 6.1 | Changed to reflect potential for subcontractor work scope modifications. | Clarification only. |
| 24 paragraphs 3-5 | 6.2 | Changed to reflect changes in Principal Subcontractor work scope | Change in the company performing the work. Does not change the quality assurance requirements associated with performing the work. |
| 26 | 6.3.4 | Changed Approved Subcontractors List to Evaluated Subcontractors List | Name change only to more accurately reflect the purpose of the list. |
| 26 | 6.3.4 | Changed next to last bullet from "Conducting Audits" to "Evaluating the implementation of the Site Quality Assurance Program by the AE/CCMs, Principal Subcontractors and Kaiser-Hill through the conduct of Quality Audits" | Clarification only. |
| 26 | 6.3.4 | Added "Initiating Stop Work Process, when appropriate" | Added an existing responsibility for purposes of clarification only |
| 26 | 6.3.4 | Added "Conduct the Annual Quality Audit of for Site Implementation of TRU and Low Level Waste Programs as required by the waste repositories" | Added an existing responsibility for purposes of clarification only |
| 27 | 6.3.6 | Added "Providing oversight of work performed by lower tier and AE/CCM subcontractors for work performed in their area of responsibility." | Added an existing responsibility for purposes of clarification only |
| 27 | 6.3.7 | Added "Individual Managers" to Responsibility section | Already existing responsibilities. No impact. |
| 28 | 6.3.8 | Added TRU Waste Program Quality Assurance Officer to Responsibility section | Added existing position and responsibilities for information purposes. No impact. |
| 28 | 6.3.9 | Added Low-Level Waste Program Quality Assurance Officer to Responsibility section | Added existing position and responsibilities for information purposes. No impact |
| 32 | 7.1.1.2 | Deleted information paragraph regarding Infrastructure changes between publication of Revision 6 and Revision 7. | No impact. |
| 33 | 7.1.1.3 | Added references to IWCP Manual, SDRM, and SCARM | Clarification only |
| 34 | 7.1.2.3 | Added reference to the TRU Waste Characterization Training Implementation Plan | Information only. |

Summary of Changes from Revision 7 of the Kaiser-Hill Team Quality Assurance Plan

| PAGE PARAGRAPH | SECTION | CHANGE | IMPACT TO QAP COMPLIANCE WITH 10 CFR 830.120 |
|-------------------|---------|--|---|
| 37 | 7.1.4.2 | Paragraph deleted to reflect completion of 10 CFR 830.120 Implementation Plan commitment regarding procedures upgrades to reflect change from Management and Operations to an Integrated Management Contract | No impact. |
| 38 | 7.1.4.2 | Modified to reflect transfer of responsibility for Engineering Document Control to RMRS | Change in responsibility not in quality requirements |
| 38 | 7.1.4.3 | Modified to reflect 1-7700-DC-001 has been superceded by 1-MAN-063-DC | Procedure updated and reissued under new number. No impact. |
| 39 | 7.1.4.3 | Added sentence "The SDRM requires the consideration of and the inclusion of records requirements in the preparation of procedures and instructions | Clarification only |
| 39 | 7.1.4.3 | Added reference to 1-PRO-077-WIPP-005 | Information only |
| 41 paragraph 4 | 7.2.1.3 | Modified to reference company specific welding program documents | Information only |
| 43 | 7.2.2.2 | Added three paragraphs regarding software quality assurance | Clarification of existing requirements. |
| 45 | 7.2.3.2 | Procedure 4-J55-ADM-08.01 superceded by 1-J55-ADM-08.01 | Procedure was revised from a Kaiser-Hill to a Kaiser-Hill Team procedure to allow authorized Principal Subcontractors to perform their own supplier evaluation. |
| 45 | 7.2.3.2 | Added discussion of Analytical Program Office responsibility regarding its procurement quality assurance evaluation of analytical services subcontractors | Added to document previously existing responsibilities |
| 45 | 7.2.3.2 | Added paragraph to reflect responsibilities of the Customer Service Organization (CSO). | The responsibilities of the CSO were expanded to allow for closer control for the acquisition of waste commodities. |
| 45 | 7.2.3.3 | Modified to reflect Volume III of the Procurement Systems document | Document previously existed. Added for information purposes only. |
| 48 | 7.3.1.3 | Modified to reflect procedure 1-Q05-ADM-02.26 was superceded by 1-MAN-075-SMM, <i>Standards Management Manual</i> | Procedure superceded. Reference change. No impact. |
| 50 | 8.0 | Modified to reflect completion of the Commitments in the 10 CFR 830.120 Implementation Plan. | No impact. Non-compliances with 10 CRF 830.120 are reported in accordance with the Site Price-Anderson Amendments Act Reporting process. |

6/16
RGC-024-99